

Christology and Grace in the Additions to Augustine's De Haeresibus

by MICHAEL WOLFGANG EBER

Freie Universität, Berlin

E-mail: m.eber@fu-berlin.de

While a great number of manuscripts of Augustine's De haeresibus add to the text chapters on the Christological heresies that arose after Augustine's death, modern editions offer only a confused picture of their transmission. This article identifies three distinct sets of additional chapters, and analyses their sources, possible origins and theological implications. It demonstrates that their authors were taking distinct positions in the debate over neo-Chalcedonianism, the interpretation of Chalcedonian Christology that started to become dominant in the early sixth century. The additions also provide evidence that many neo-Chalcedonians saw an Augustinian understanding of grace as complementary to their Christology.

By the sixth century, users of Augustine's *De haeresibus*¹ – a list of summaries of the (real and imagined) beliefs of different (real and imagined) heretics – had grown discontented with this text. It lacked any information on the Christological heresies that occupied four consecutive ecumenical Councils after Augustine's death: the

ACO = Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum; BAV = Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City; BM = Bibliothèque municipale; BNF = Bibliothèque national de France, Paris; CCSL = Corpus Christianorum Series Latina; CLA = *Codices Latini Antiquiores*; *JTS* = *Journal of Theological Studies*; MGH = Monumenta Germaniae Historicae: Epp = Epistulae; SS rer. Merov. = Scriptorum rerum Merovingicarum; PL = *Patrologia Latina*; SB = Staatsbibliothek

I would like to thank Mateusz Fafinski for his helpful comments, Eduardo Otero Pereira for sending me an article otherwise inaccessible to me, as well as Céline Leroux of the Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris, and the members of the Département images et prestations numériques at the BNF for sending me images of some as-yet undigitised manuscripts.

¹ Augustine of Hippo, *De haeresibus*, ed. R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beukers, CCSL xlvii, Turnhout 1969, 283–345.

Council of Ephesus in 431 had condemned the radical dyophysite Nestorius, that of Chalcedon in 451 had anathemised the radical miaphysite Eutyches. The debate over where exactly the *via media* between these two Christological extremes lay continued for more than two centuries and precipitated two more ecumenical councils (Constantinople 553 and 680/81).²

Unsurprisingly, then, the first Christological additions to Augustine's *De haeresibus* were made by the early sixth century at the latest: before 523, a deacon of the Roman Church named John suggested to the senator Senarius that he read a *Liber de haeresibus* that apparently contained information on the Pelagians – the last original, Augustinian chapter – the Eutychians and the Nestorians.³ Adding information on these heresies soon seems to have become the norm: a sixth-century manuscript recording only the chapter list of *De haeresibus* ends with Nestorians and Eutychians.⁴ In the oldest extant complete manuscript of *De haeresibus*, also written in the sixth century, an eighth-century scribe added the disappointed note: 'Nestoriana et Eutychiana hic scripta non sunt' ('The Nestorian and Eutychian [heresies] are not described here').⁵ In an eighth-century manuscript, a scribe added chapters on these heresies on the empty verso leaf before the beginning of the text, adding above: 'Hoc adiungendum est in fine sequentis libelli de heresibus' ('This should be added at the end of the following book on heresies').⁶ Even an early ninth-century version of *De haeresibus* that had gone through at least two rounds of abridgement contains information on Nestorians and Eutychians.⁷ Beyond that, a great number of medieval scribes added chapters on these two opposing heresies to their copy of *De haeresibus* – not all of them offering the same information.⁸

Given that medieval scribes soon treated the additional chapters as indispensable parts of the text, it is remarkable that they have never been subject to a systematic study – including by any of the editors of *De haeresibus*. This article aims to fill this gap in two ways: firstly, it will disentangle the transmission of the various versions of chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians. This will also necessitate a discussion of the chapter on 'Timotheans'

² For an exhaustive account of the Christological debates up until the Monothelete controversy see C. Lange, *Mia energia: Untersuchungen zur Einigungspolitik des Kaisers Heraclius und des Patriarchen Sergius von Constantinopel*, Tübingen 2012.

³ Johannes Diaconus, *Sublimitatis vestrae paginam*, ed. A. Wilmart, Rome 1933, 176; A. Gillett, *Envoys and political communication in the late antique West, 411–533*, Cambridge 2003, 214–15, esp. n. 146.

⁴ BAV, ms Reg. lat. 2077, fo. 101r; F. Troncarelli, 'Osservazioni sul Reginense Latino 2077', *Scriptorium* lxiii/1 (2014), 85–90.

⁵ SB, Bamberg, ms Patr. 87, fo. 79v; E. A. Lowe, *CLA* v, no. 1031.

⁶ Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, Naples, ms ex Vind. lat. 2, fo. 20v; Lowe, *CLA* iii, no. 391.

⁷ BNF, ms lat. 3848B, fo. 185v; Lowe, *CLA* v, no. 555.

⁸ See appendix, below.

(the followers of Timotheos Aeluros, the miaphysite patriarch of Alexandria, 457–60, 475–7)⁹ that appears in most editions of *De haeresibus*, as well as of a chapter on 'Predestinarians' (those who believe that some humans are predestined to damnation, some to salvation) that does not appear in any edition but, as will be argued, should.

Secondly, it will examine the sources, possible origins and theological implications of the different sets of additional chapters for the first time. The additions to *De haeresibus* are an as-yet unutilised source of evidence for Latin writers' breadth of opinion on and engagement with the Christological debates of the fifth and sixth centuries. They imply distinct positions in the debate over the interpretation of the Chalcedonian definition of faith, and while they appear in different combinations, medieval scribes working on *De haeresibus* never mingled chapters that implied different 'Chalcedonianisms'. They were also aware of the intersection of the Christological debates with the controversy around Augustine's teaching on divine grace; hence, the combinations of additional chapters also betray distinct 'Augustinianisms' on the part of the continuators.

Previous editions of the additional chapters

First, however, the sets of additional chapters have to be distinguished – which the modern editions of *De haeresibus* make rather difficult.¹⁰ In Basle, in 1505/6, Johannes Amerbach published the first printed edition of Augustine's *opera omnia*; in the eleventh tome, *De haeresibus* appeared without any additional chapters.¹¹ This edition was the basis for that of Desiderius Erasmus, also published in Basle shortly thereafter. Here, *De haeresibus* appears with the addition of (only) a chapter on the *Timotheani*, which Erasmus reports having transcribed from a manuscript from the abbey of Gembloux.¹² In 1576, Erasmus' edition was emended by the Louvain theologians, who copied the chapter on the Timotheans

⁹ On him see P. Blaudeau, 'Timothee Aelure et la direction ecclésiastique de l'empire post-chalcédonien', *Revue des études byzantines* liv/1 (1996), 107–33.

¹⁰ On the early editions of Augustine's works see K. B. Steinhauser, 'Manuscripts', in A. Fitzgerald and others (eds.), *Augustine through the ages: an encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids, MI–Cambridge 1999, 527–8, and D. Weber, 'Handschriften-Tradition und Ausgaben', in V. H. Drecoll (ed.), *Augustin Handbuch*, Stuttgart–Tübingen 2014, 4–7.

¹¹ *Undecima pars librorum divi Aurelii Augustini quorum mentionem nom fecit in libris Retractionum*, ed. J. Amerbach, Basle 1506.

¹² *Tomus VI. operum D. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi, continens τὰ πολεμικά, hoc est, Decertationes aduersus haereses, praecipue Iudaeorum, Manichaeorum, Priscillianistarum, Origenistarum, Arrianorum, & Iouiniani, nunc multis in locis summo studio emendatus*, ed. D. Erasmus, Basle 1529, repr. 1569, 34. The manuscript in question has not been identified. According to A. Derolez, B. Victor and W. Bracke no manuscript with a Gembloux provenance contains *De haeresibus: Corpus catalogorum Belgii: the*

that Erasmus had found and added two more, one on Nestorians and one on Eutychians.¹³ In the appendix, they made clear that the first one only appeared in the Gembloux manuscript, whereas their other manuscripts added the remaining two chapters.¹⁴ In the late seventeenth century, the Maurists again emended the edition of the Louvain theologians by collating it with a number of manuscripts that had been unknown to the latter. The text of the additional chapters remained the same, but they altered the information on the provenance of the three additions: ‘Hic certe finitur Augustini liber: tametsi in codicibus manuscriptis plerisque addantur Nestoriani et Eutychiani ..., et in quibusdam etiam Timotheani, hoc ordine: [Timotheans, Nestorians, Eutychians]’ (Augustine’s book certainly ends here, though in many manuscripts, [chapters on] Nestorians and Eutychians are added ..., and in some also [a chapter on] Timotheans, in this order: [Timotheans, Nestorians, Eutychians]).¹⁵

While they were certainly correct that the chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians were much more common than that on Timotheans, the statement on the order of the chapters was false. In all volumes of *Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des Heiligen Augustinus*, only a single manuscript – Universiteitsbibliotheek, Utrecht, ms 61, written in the congregation of canons regular in Utrecht – is listed that actually transmits the three additional chapters as given by the Louvain theologians and the Maurists together; even in this fifteenth-century codex, the chapter on the Timotheans is the last rather than the first addition.¹⁶ At any rate, the Maurists apparently did not use this manuscript – no *codex Traiectensis* appears in the list of manuscripts that they consulted.¹⁷

medieval booklists of the southern Low Countries, VII: *The surviving manuscripts and incunables from medieval Belgian libraries*, Brussels 2009, 123–8.

¹³ *Tomus VI. operum D. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi, continens τὰ πολεμικά: hoc est decertationes adversus haereses, praecipuae Iudaeorum, Manichaeorum, Priscillianistarum, Origenistarum, Arrianorum, & Ioviniani: nunc multis in locis summo studio emendatus, per Theologos Lovanienses*, ed. T. Gozaeus and J. Molanus, Antwerp 1576, 15.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 372.

¹⁵ *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi Operum tomus octavus continens opuscula polemica adversus haereses, manichaeorum, priscillianistarum & arianorum post Lovaniensium theologorum recognitionem correcta denuo ad manuscriptos codices Gallicanos, Vaticanos &c. nec non ad editiones antiquiores & castigatores opera et studio monachorum ordinis S. Benedicti, e congregatione S. Mauri*, ed. T. Blampin and P. Coustant, Paris 1688, repr. 1694, cols 27–8. The Maurists’ edition was reprinted in *PL* xlii; for the additional chapters, see col. 50 n. 2.

¹⁶ Universiteitsbibliotheek, Utrecht, ms 61, fo. 44v. For the provenance of this manuscript, see the notes on the inside of the cover and on fo. 129r. Cf. M. T. Wieser, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, VIII/1: *Belgien, Luxemburg und Niederlande: Werkverzeichnis*, Vienna 2000, 89.

¹⁷ See *Sancti Aurelii Augustini*, col. 1005. They compared the Louvain edition ‘ad codices Vaticanos quinque, et ad Gallicanos duodecim, scilicet Regios duos, quattuor Colbertinos, Dominicanarum maioris conventus Parisiensis unum, ad Victorinum,

However, the Maurists did use manuscripts that contained a chapter on Timotheans. Not all of their codices have been identified,¹⁸ but thanks to their notes pertaining to the edition, it is clear that their *codex Victorinus* (i.e. from the monastery of St-Victor in Paris) is now Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, Paris, MS 250.¹⁹ The Jesuit Jacques Sirmond had, only some decades earlier, accurately described this same manuscript as adding chapters on Predestinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians and Timotheans to *De haeresibus*, with the middle two being distinct from the chapters on these heresies that the Maurists took over from the Louvain theologians.²⁰ These same four additions can also be found in BAV, MS Vat. lat. 511, fo. 42r, which was one of the 'codices Vaticanos quinque' used by the Maurists.²¹ Both transmit the same note before the additions: 'Finit relatio sancti Augustini episcopi de haeresibus. Haec vero quae sequuntur a sancto Gennadio Massiliensi presbytero sunt posita' ('Here ends the holy bishop Augustine's account of heresies. What follows was written by the holy presbyter Gennadius of Marseille'). Thus, the Maurists did not only provide erroneous information when they stated that the chapter on Timotheans preceded a chapter on Nestorians and Eutychians in any of their manuscripts. They also left no indication of the facts that it was ascribed to Gennadius of Marseille, that Gennadius' chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians in the *Victorinus* and *Vaticanus* codices were different from the ones they took over from the Louvain edition, or, crucially, that information on Predestinarianism ever was added to *De haeresibus*. Since the Maurists' unpublished notes contain the correct information,²² this seems to have been a conscious decision. They may not have wanted to add fodder to the Jesuits' ongoing campaign against Jansenism (named

Becheronensem, Beccensem, Floriacensem, Michaelinum'. Nor, incidentally, was the Utrecht manuscript used by the Louvain theologians: cf. *Tomus VI. operum*, 371.

¹⁸ For possible identifications see appendix below. The codex Beccensis is the only one for which no hypothesis could be put forward here, though it can probably be identified with an entry in a twelfth-century booklist of the monastery of Le Bec: L. Cleaver, 'The monastic library at Le Bec', in B. Pohl and L. L. Gathagan (eds), *A companion to the abbey of Le Bec in the central Middle Ages (11th–13th centuries)*, Boston 2018, 197, no. 28. The later fate of this manuscript is unknown, however; cf. the discussion of identifiable Le Bec manuscripts in J. Weston, 'Manuscripts and book production at Le Bec', in Pohl and Gathagan, *A companion*, 144–8.

¹⁹ R. Kukula, *Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Literatur und der Kirche im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV.*, iii/2, Vienna 1898, 67; G. Ouy, *Les Manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor: catalogue établi sur la base du répertoire de Claude de Grandrue (1514)*, ii, Paris 1999, 202.

²⁰ J. Sirmond, *Historia praedestiniana, quibus initiis exorta, et per quos potissimum profulgata praedestinatorum haeresis olim fuerit, et oppressa*, Paris 1648, 38–9.

²¹ Kukula, *Die Mauriner Ausgabe*, 67.

²² In BNF, MS lat. 11646, fo. 288r, the differences in order, content and author of the additional chapters in the Vatican manuscripts are noted correctly, including the fact that BAV, MS Vat. lat. 511 contains a chapter on Predestinarians.

after Cornelius Jansen, bishop of Ypern 1636–8), in the context of which Sirmond had penned his rather more accurate description of the *codex Victorinus*. Those who subscribed to (or were accused of subscribing to) Jansenism – among them many Maurists – believed Augustine’s teaching on grace and free will to be consistent with the Predestinarianism that Gennadius had defined as a heresy; it is thus not surprising that they preferred to pass in silence over the chapters Sirmond had transcribed.²³

After a long pause in editorial activity, two critical editions were completed in 1969. At the University of Vienna, Leo Bazant-Hegemark edited *De haeresibus* for his doctoral dissertation. He only included additional chapters that he found in the Maurists’ edition and in at least one of his manuscripts. Since he did not use either Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 250, or BAV, MS Vat. lat. 511, he left out the chapter on Timotheans. He also pointed out whenever a manuscript would transmit different chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians than the ones edited by the Maurists, but did not offer editions of these alternative chapters.²⁴

In the same year, Roel Vander Plaetse and Clemens Beukers published a critical edition of *De haeresibus* in the *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*. In an appendix to the Augustinian text,²⁵ they reprinted the chapters on Timotheans (I), Nestorians (II) and Eutychians (III) from the Maurists’ edition, collating the latter two with their own manuscripts, and adding editions of the alternative chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians (IIa and IIIa) – distinct from both II and III and the Gennadian chapters on these heresies. Vander Plaetse and Beukers left out the Maurists’ assertion on the order of the chapters, but did not explicitly clarify the actual relation of their chapter I to II and III (or, for that matter, to IIa and IIIa). They also did not add the other three Gennadian chapters preceding the one on Timotheans in the manuscripts that do transmit it, even though they cited Germain Morin’s 1907 article showing that it was, in fact, the last of four chapters that should be attributed to Gennadius.²⁶ Thus, the Maurists’ – perhaps intentionally –

²³ On the connections of the Maurists’ editorial project to their position in the debate over Augustine’s understanding of grace see, for example, J.-R. Amorgathe, ‘De l’Augustinus à saint Augustin: Arnould et l’édition des Mauristes’, and J.-L. Quantin, ‘L’Œuvre mauriste et ses détracteurs’, in J.-C. Fredouille (ed.), *Les Mauristes à Saint-Germain-des-Prés: actes du colloque de Paris (2 décembre 1999)*, Paris 2001, 47–58, 59–84; and B. Neveu, ‘Le Statut théologique de saint Augustin au xvii^e siècle’, in B. Neveu (ed.), *Érudition et religion aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles*, Paris 1994, 487–9.

²⁴ L. Bazant-Hegemark, ‘Aurelii Augustini Liber ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas, Sermo adversus Iudaeos, Liber de haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum: Text und textkritischer Apparat’, unpubl. PhD diss. Vienna 1969, 175–7.

²⁵ *Appendix to De haeresibus*, ed. R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beukers, CCSL xlv, Turnhout 1969, 348–51.

²⁶ G. Morin, ‘Le Liber dogmatum de Gennade de Marseille et problèmes qui s’y rattachent’, *Revue bénédictine* xxiv/4 (1907), 445–55; *Appendix to De haeresibus*, 348.

misleading image of the transmission of the additions to *De haeresibus* has not been fundamentally amended since the seventeenth century.

Christological basics

Before this long overdue amendment can be undertaken, however, it might be helpful to provide a brief overview of the relevant theological debates. The Council of Chalcedon (451) had decreed that Christ was to be acknowledged 'in two natures ..., the distinctive character of each nature being preserved and coming together into one person and one hypostasis'.²⁷ Among the adherents of this definition, however, there was disagreement over which part of it was to be stressed particularly. If, as especially some Western theologians seemed to think, Nestorius' main error had been in denying the full divinity of Christ, and Eutyches had failed to ascribe full humanity to him, an orthodox Christology would mainly expound how the 'distinctive character of each nature' could be preserved in the one person of Christ. The followers of this tradition did so chiefly by distinguishing between Christ's 'divine' and 'human' acts; Christ's suffering on the cross, for example, was proof of his full humanity, since, in their eyes, it certainly could not be attributed to his divinity.²⁸ If, however, the issue was that Nestorius had not been able to express adequately the unity of Christ's two natures, and instead believed his human and divine natures to be two separately acting subjects, the challenge of orthodox Christology was to spell out how the two natures could come together 'into one person and hypostasis', that is into a true ontological unity. This was the interpretation of the so-called neo-Chalcedonians, whose theology began to become dominant especially in the East in the early sixth century.²⁹ The adherents of the earliest neo-Chalcedonian movement, Theopaschitism, advocated for formulas that could express how Christ's divinity took part in the suffering on the

²⁷ 'εν δύο φύσεσιν ... σωζόμενης δε μάλλον της ιδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἐν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης': *Concilium Chalcedonense* a. 451: *definitio fidei (versio graeca)*, ed. E. Schwartz, ACO ii/1.ii, Berlin–Leipzig 1933, 129, trans. M. Gaddis and R. Price, in *The acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, ii, Liverpool 2005, 204.

²⁸ B. Green, *The soteriology of Leo the Great*, Oxford 2008, 208, 227–30; K.-H. Uthemann, 'Zur Rezeption des Tomus Leonis in und nach Chalkedon: Wider den dogmenhistorischen Begriff "strenger Chalkedonismus"', in K.-H. Uthemann (ed.), *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe: Themen der frühen Kirche als Beiträge zu einer historischen Theologie*, Berlin 2005, 34–6.

²⁹ P. T. R. Gray, 'Neuchalkedonismus', in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, xxiv, Berlin–New York 1995, 289–96; K.-H. Uthemann, 'Der Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monotheletismus: ein Beitrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus', in Uthemann, *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe*, 207–56.

cross; to the Theopaschites, ascribing it only to the human Christ was tantamount to Nestorianism. Given this disagreement, the different constructions of the Christological extremes in the different continuations of *De haeresibus* can give insight into the different continuators' positions on what would constitute Christological orthodoxy.

Sources and tendencies of the Christological additions

Previously unknown chapters

Having untangled the editorial history of the different sets of additions and set the stage theologically, they can now be analysed separately, starting with chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians that have not made it into any edition. They are found in BNF, MS lat. 5600, fos 130r–131r (saec. x/xi), and BNF, MS lat. 2787, fo. 16r–v (saec. xi).³⁰ Since both manuscripts are quite late and only transmit an abridged version of *De haeresibus* (and MS lat. 2787 only parts of it), it is not surprising that these did not show up on the editors' radar. However, the additional chapters must be of considerably earlier date: the same abridged version of *De haeresibus* is also found in a late eighth/early ninth-century codex (BNF, MS lat. 1564) – though without the ending, since several quires are missing.³¹ BNF, MS lat. 3848B, another late eighth/early ninth-century codex, transmits an even more shortened version. The additional chapters in this manuscript are clearly based on the ones transmitted in BNF, MSS lat. 600 and 2787, most obviously in the chapters on Nestorians and in the respective first sentences of the chapters on Eutychians (see Table 1). In the following excerpt from the *definitio fidei* of the council of Chalcedon in MS lat. 5600, several specific miaphysite dogmata are anathemised, each introduced by 'hos qui audent/dicunt etc'. In MS lat. 3848B, this is summarised as 'hos omnes anathematezat sancta et apostolica aecclesia et omnes sequates eorum', without giving a clear idea of who 'hos omnes' would be. Thus, the additions must have been penned by the late eighth century at the latest; judging by the age of their sources, they may have been written as early as the 450s. The chapter on Nestorians is an extremely truncated rendition of ch xii.9–xiii.4 of Vincent of Lérins's *Commonitorium* (written in 434),³² defining Nestorianism both as wanting to introduce a duality of

³⁰ For information on the dating, provenance and contents of these manuscripts see <<https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc64566v>>, and <<https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc605702>>, accessed 20 Jan. 2022.

³¹ Lowe, *CLA* v, no. 529. See also CCSL xlv, ed. R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beukers, Turnhout 1969, 290–333 (lowest page sections).

³² Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium*, ed. R. Demeulenaere, CCSL lxiv, Turnhout 1985, 163–4.

Table 1. *The additional chapters in the once- and twice-abridged versions of De haeresibus*

BNF, MS lat. 5600, fo. 130r-v	BNF, MS lat. 3838B, fo. 185r
'Nestorius duas in Christo distinguere vult naturas, duas introducit personas, et inaudito sclere duos Christos, unum deum et alterum hominem. Dicit Christum non deum natum sed hominum solum, blasphemam et multo tempore, et nihil inter ipsum et ceteros homines fuisse dicit. Anathema igitur Nestorio negante ex uirgine natum adferente duos Christos extortam trinitatis fidem quatrinitatem nobis introducenti.'	'Nestorius duas in Christo distinguere vult naturas, duas introducit personas et duas Christos, unum deum et alterum hominem.'
'Euthicis hereticus deum qui conmixto atque confuso blasphemans...'	'Euthicis hominem deumque commixto atque confusum dicit...'

persons (instead of a duality of natures) in Christ, and as seeing Christ as a mere man. The chapter on Eutychians consists almost entirely of a lengthy quotation from the oldest Latin translation of the *definitio fidei* of the Council of Chalcedon.³³

In some manuscripts of this version of the *definitio*, Christ's two natures are said to be acknowledged as 'coming together in one person, *but not* in one substance' ('sub una persona, non sub una substantia conuenientes'), clearly the work of a Latin translator who had trouble with the Greek phrase 'εις εν προσωπον και μιαν υποστασιν συντρεχούσης' ('coming together in one person and one hypostasis'). Having translated *υπόστασις* as *substantia*, they seem to have worried that this could be read as a synonym for *natura*, so they added a *non* to leave no room for a (crypto-)miaphysite interpretation.³⁴ Since this clearly reveals the translator's staunchly anti-miaphysite priorities, it is worth mentioning that the author of this chapter on Eutychians used a manuscript with the added *non* already excised. This, as well as the fact that they introduce both constructions of Nestorianism, suggests that they wanted to take a rather middle-of-the-road approach, without suggesting any clear partisan position in the post-Chalcedonian debates to their readers.

³³ *Concilium Chalcedonense a. 451: definitio fidei (versio collectionis vaticanensis)*, ed. E. Schwartz, ACO ii/2.ii, Berlin–Leipzig 1936, 13, line 12–14, line 15.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 14, line 6. In later Latin translations, *υπόστασις* is rendered as 'subsistentia' or 'existentia', making the distinction with *natura* clearer; see, for example, *Concilium Chalcedonense a. 451: definitio fidei (versio Dion. II)*, ed. E. Schwartz, ACO ii/2.ii, 65, lines 15–16.

The Gennadian additions

Chapters on Predestinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians and Timotheans, beginning with ‘Praedestinati sunt qui/Nestoriani/Eutychiani/Timotheani dicunt’ respectively,³⁵ are explicitly ascribed to Gennadius of Marseille (†c. 495) in Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 250 and BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 511, as well as in BNF, MS lat. 16364.³⁶ Hincmar of Reims (†882) also used a manuscript of *De haeresibus* with these four chapters ascribed to Gennadius.³⁷ Another point in favour of Gennadius’ authorship is the fact that the text describes the heresy of the Alexandrian miaphysites in the vein of Timotheos Aeluros as distinct from the heresy of Eutyches: the *Timotheani* otherwise only appear in Gennadius’ continuation of Jerome’s bio-bibliography *De viris illustribus* and in his *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*.³⁸ The four chapters are probably a fragment of the *Catalogus*

³⁵ The chapters are edited as an appendix to Ps.-Jerome’s *Indiculus de haeresibus*, in *Corpus haeresiologicus*, i. ed. F. Oehler, Berlin 1856, 297–300, though note that the Gennadian chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians are here – but not in the manuscripts of *De haeresibus* – combined with information that also appears in Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* VIII.v.64–5, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford 1911. The state of edition of the additions to the *Indiculus* is even more deplorable than that of the additions to *De haeresibus*, but cannot be untangled here. I have not been able to find a manuscript that transmits what Oehler – following Faustino Arevalo and Claude Menard – published after the *Indiculus*’ chapter on Eunomians, though it deserves mentioning that in Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, MS Guelf. 64, while the text of the *Indiculus* ends with Eunomians (fo. 115v), the chapter list (fos 110v–111r) announces ten more chapters after this, ending with ‘XLVI Nestoriani XLVII Euthecitae XLVIII Timothiani’. Chapters on three other heresies (*Audian*, *Euet[h]iani* and *Nistages*) that only appear after the *Eunomiani* in this chapter list are explicitly ascribed to Gennadius in a version of the *Indiculus* transmitted in Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid, MS 80, fo. 17r (on these chapters see E. Otero Pereira, ‘Consideraciones acerca de la tradición hispana del “Indiculus de haeresibus” atribuido a Jerónimo y su “Continuatio” atribuida a Genadio de Marsella en el Cód. 80 de la Real Academia de la Historia’, in A. Aires Nascimento and P. Farmhouse Alberto [eds.], *IV Congreso Internacional de Latin Medieval Hispánico: Actas*, Lisbon 2006, 671–9). Neither the chapter list in the Wolfenbüttel manuscript nor the Madrid manuscript contains a chapter on Predestinarians, however.

³⁶ Morin, ‘Le *Liber dogmatum*’, 451. According to M. Oberleitner, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, I/1: *Italien: Werkverzeichnis*, Vienna 1969, 94, the same four additions can be found in BAV, MS Arch.Cap.S.Pietro B.49, fos 121r–v. Oberleitner does not mention if the additions are also ascribed to Gennadius here. There may also be more manuscripts that transmit these four chapters.

³⁷ Hincmar of Reims, *De praedestinatione Dei et libero arbitrio* 1, ed J.-P. Migne, *PL* cxxv, Paris 1852, col. 70.

³⁸ C. H. Turner, ‘The *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*: supplenda to J.T.S. vii 78–99’, *JTS* o.s. viii/29 (1906), 107; Morin, ‘Le *Liber dogmatum*’, 453; cf. Gennadius of Marseille, *De viris illustribus* 2, ed. E. C. Richardson, Leipzig 1896, 62, and C. H. Turner, ‘The *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum* attributed to Gennadius’, *JTS* o.s. vii/25 (1905), 89.

haereticorum that he alludes to several times in *De viris illustribus*; most notably for our purposes, he states that information on Nestorius' dogma could be found in the *Catalogus*.³⁹ He seems to have written it in 475, during Timotheos Aeluros's short stay in Constantinople.⁴⁰

Gennadius is a prime example of the tendency of some Western theologians to see both Nestorianism and Eutychianism as heresies ascribing only a single nature to Christ. He sees in Nestorius an adherent of *Bewahrungschristologie* (Christology of merit), according to which Christ was only human, but taken up by God as merited by his sinlessness. Unwilling to attribute such human activities as being born, suffering and dying to God, he would rather deny Christ's divinity. Eutyches, in turn, was supposed to have denied the true humanity of Christ, claiming that his corporeal form was only similar to a human body.⁴¹ In this presentation of the Christological issues, therefore, the neo-Chalcedonian project of stressing the ontological unity of Christ's two natures might seem as if it would open the door to both Nestorianism and Eutychianism – and indeed, this is what some Westerners later accused the neo-Chalcedonians of.⁴²

The heresy of the Timotheans, too, is understood as denying two natures of Christ, though here – somewhat more in line with actual miaphysite thought⁴³ – Gennadius claims that they believed the incarnation 'dissolved and compacted the two natures – i.e. God and Man – into one mass' ('*duae naturae, id est deus et homo, in unam resolutae et compactae massam*'). He stresses that in such an understanding of the incarnation, the 'qualities of the [respectively] active nature' would 'be changed' ('*immutata ... naturarum proprietate efficientium*').⁴⁴ Thus one may infer that, in his view, an orthodox Christology would be able to prove the duality of Christ's natures by clearly distinguishing between his 'human' and 'divine' actions.

Since Augustine died before even the Nestorian controversy had reached full swing, it is not surprising that Gennadius' formulations of Christological heresies seemed compatible with the original text of *De*

³⁹ E. Sottocorno, 'Un frammento del *Catalogus haereticorum* de Genadio de Marsella', *Actas y comunicaciones del Instituto de Historia Antigua y Medieval* xii (2017), 9–17; cf. Gennadius of Marseille, *De viris illustribus* 80. The chapter list in ms Guelf. 64 (see n. 35, above) may provide some idea of what else was part of the *Catalogus*.

⁴⁰ 'Timotheus, apud Bizam Bithyniae [= Constantinople] modo exulans civitatem, continentis et religiosae vitae imagine multis illudit': Gennadius of Marseille, *Catalogus haereticorum*, ed. F. Oehler, *Corpus haereseologicum*, i, Berlin 1856, 300.

⁴¹ Gennadius of Marseille, *Catalogus haereticorum*, 298–9.

⁴² Cf. P. T. R. Gray and M. Herren, 'Columbanus and the Three Chapters controversy – a new approach', *JTS* xlv/1 (1994), 160–70.

⁴³ Gennadius of Marseille claims to have translated a *libellus* written by Timotheos Aeluros into Latin: *De viris illustribus* 73. It is thus not surprising that he could render his positions most realistically.

⁴⁴ Idem, *Catalogus haereticorum*, 299–300.

haeresibus. The fact that Augustine's lengthy treatment of Pelagianism at the end of *De haeresibus* could immediately be followed by Gennadius' definition of Predestinarianism – the belief in double predestination, i.e. that God predestined some humans to salvation, some to damnation⁴⁵ – may seem more puzzling: Gennadius is often described as a 'semi-Pelagian', as the opponents of Augustine's fully developed teachings on grace and free will would come to be known in the early modern era. Where Augustine believed that, because of original sin, humans were dependent on God's saving grace to even be able to want to believe correctly and do good works, thus ascribing a relatively minor role to human agency in salvation, the semi-Pelagians tended to see more of a balance between human agency and divine grace.⁴⁶

However, even at the Council of Orange in 529, when several Gallic bishops led by Caesarius of Arles condemned semi-Pelagian doctrine and prescribed the Augustinian dogma of prevenient grace – i.e. that faith and good works would be impossible to achieve for humans without God's grace first calling them – they still also condemned the belief in predestination to damnation.⁴⁷ At least until the sixth century, therefore, the teachings of Augustine and of Gennadius on grace were not necessarily seen as conflicting – a point also made by Hincmar of Reims in the ninth century when trying to refute Gottschalk of Orbais's defence of double predestination, and again by Jacques Sirmond in his invective against Cornelius Jansen in the seventeenth century. Both used the fact that *De haeresibus* and the Gennadian additions are transmitted together as proof of their agreement.⁴⁸ It should be noted, though, that these are the only additions to *De haeresibus* where medieval scribes felt it necessary to point out explicitly that they did not form part of the original text, suggesting that the compatibility of the Augustinian and Gennadian doctrines of grace was always contested.

⁴⁵ Ibid. 297–8.

⁴⁶ On the controversy around Augustine's doctrine of grace in the fifth/sixth century see R. H. Weaver, *Divine grace and human agency: a study of the semi-Pelagian controversy*, Macon, GA 1996; on the history of term see I. D. Backus and A. Goudriaan, "Semipelagianism": the origins of the term and its passage into the history of heresy', this JOURNAL LXV/1 (2014), 25–46. For Gennadius' 'Semipelagianism', compare his rather more sympathetic descriptions of theologians like John Cassian (Gennadius of Marseille, *De viris illustribus* 62), Vincent of Lérins (ibid. 65), and Faustus of Riez (ibid. 86) to his treatment of Augustine (ibid. 39) or his most influential Gallic defender, Prosper of Aquitaine (ibid. 85).

⁴⁷ *Concilium Arausicanum* a. 529, ed. C. de Clerq, CCSL cxlviiiA, Turnhout 1963, 63, lines 209–12; Weaver, *Divine grace*, 231–2; R. W. Mathisen, 'Caesarius of Arles, prevenient grace, and the second council of Orange', in A. Y. Hwang, B. J. Matz and A. Casiday (eds), *Grace for grace: the debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, Washington, DC 2014, 219.

⁴⁸ See nn. 37, 20 above.

Two sets of neo-Chalcedonian chapters

While Gennadius' condemnation of Predestinarianism seemed compatible with Augustine's *De haeresibus*, at least to some medieval scribes, none of them apparently saw Gennadius' condemnation of the 'Timothean' miaphysites as compatible with any of the chapters on Nestorians and Eutychians that appear in the modern editions.⁴⁹ Among themselves, however, these chapters could be rather freely combined: while the chapter on Eutychians that appears as IIIa in the CCSL edition – of which only three manuscripts are known anyway – always follows chapter II on Nestorians, chapter III is found together with both II and IIa in many manuscripts. These additions seem to have been made at different points in the transmission process, since the combinations do not correspond to the stemma established by Vander Plaetse and Beukers.⁵⁰

All four of these chapters seem to have originated in a neo-Chalcedonian context. Chapter II, the most common chapter on Nestorians, starts with a very similar construction of this heresy as the Gennadian chapter: Nestorius is said to have seen Christ as a 'mere man' ('hom[o] tantum') who was only later taken up by God.⁵¹ However, a different approach was taken by this author when it came to properly defining the subject of Christ's *prima facie* human actions: where Gennadius wrote that 'God was born and suffered in a human' ('deum in homine ... natum vel passum')⁵² – still displaying some hesitancy over ascribing suffering directly to the divine Christ – and stressed the need to differentiate the 'qualities of the active nature' in the chapter on Timotheans,⁵³ for the author of this chapter, Nestorius' biggest mistake was not saying that the 'God-man' ('deus homo') Christ had suffered and was buried.⁵⁴ In this, they were clearly inspired by a group of neo-Chalcedonian monks from *Scythia minor* who, among other things, pushed for the formula 'unus ex trinitate passus est carne' ('one of the trinity suffered in the flesh') beginning in the mid-510s. This Theopaschite formula was endorsed by Justinian already in 520, and (after initial resistance by Pope Hormisdas) also by Pope John II in 534.⁵⁵ While the author of the chapter in question did not use the same words as the Scythian monks, they evidently shared their concern – and that of the neo-Chalcedonians more broadly – to properly express the

⁴⁹ The fifteenth-century scribe of Universiteitsbibliotheek, Utrecht, MS 61 being the lone exception. ⁵⁰ See appendix below.

⁵¹ *Appendix to De haeresibus* II, 349, lines 1–5.

⁵² Gennadius of Marseille, *Catalogus haereticorum*, 298.

⁵³ *Ibid.* 299–300.

⁵⁴ *Appendix to De haeresibus* II, 349, lines 5–11.

⁵⁵ On the Theopaschite controversy see A. Grillmeier and T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, II/2: *Die Kirche von Konstantinopel im 6. Jahrhundert*, Freiburg–Basle–Vienna 1989, 333–59 and D. R. Maxwell, 'Christology and grace in the sixth-century Latin West: the Theopaschite controversy', unpubl. PhD diss. University of Notre Dame, IN 2003.

unity of Christ's two natures, in this case by stressing that his one, divine-human, hypostasis was subject to the passion.

Given that the Theopaschites found their most vocal Western supporter in the African bishop Fulgentius of Ruspe, Morin may well have been correct in assuming an African origin for this chapter.⁵⁶ However, an Italian or Gallic origin is just as plausible. The Roman deacon John may have referred Senarius specifically to this expanded version of *De haeresibus*,⁵⁷ since he also seems to have been sympathetic to the cause of the Scythian monks: he was the dedicatee of theological tractates that Boethius wrote in support of the neo-Chalcedonian formula of Christ 'from and in two natures' ('ex et in duabus naturis') as well as of the Theopaschite 'unus-ex-trinitate' formula.⁵⁸ The Gallic bishop Cyprian of Toulon was apparently familiar with the text as well: he tried to convince Maximus of Geneva of the orthodoxy of the phrase 'deus homo passus est' around 530, accusing him of Nestorianism if he did not subscribe to it.⁵⁹

Interestingly, the Scythian monks, Fulgentius of Ruspe and Cyprian of Toulon, were also all staunch supporters of Augustine's doctrine on grace,⁶⁰ in fact, Cyprian's dispute with Maximus may have stemmed from his defence of the dogma of prevenient grace at the Council of Valence in 528.⁶¹ In the

⁵⁶ G. Morin, 'A Travers les manuscrits de Bâle: notices et extraits des plus anciens manuscrits latins', *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde* xxvi (1927), 193. On Fulgentius' reception of the theology of the Scythian monks see A. Grillmeier, 'Vorbereitung des Mittelalters: eine Studie über das Verhältnis von Chalkedonismus und Neu-Chalkedonismus in der lateinischen Theologie von Boethius bis zu Gregor dem Großen', in A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht (eds), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, II: *Entscheidung um Chalkedon*, 4th edn, Würzburg 1973, 802–3; Maxwell, 'Christology and grace', 163–99, 242–9; B. J. Gleede, '(Neu-) Chalkedonismus bei Fulgentius von Ruspe', in U. Heil (ed.), *Das Christentum im frühen Europa: Diskurse – Tendenzen – Entscheidungen*, Berlin–Boston 2019, 263–86. ⁵⁷ See n. 3 above.

⁵⁸ Support for 'ex et in duabus naturis': Boethius, *tract.* v, ed. R. Peiper, Leipzig 1871, 186–218; support for 'unus ex trinitate passus est carne': Boethius, *tract.* ii, ed. R. Peiper, Leipzig 1871, 164–67; cf. V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der 'skythischen Kontroversen'*, Paderborn 1935, 97–136, 185–225; Grillmeier, 'Vorbereitung des Mittelalters', 792–96, 801; and B. E. Daley, 'Boethius' theological tracts and early Byzantine scholasticism', *Mediaeval Studies* xlv (1984), 178–80. For the identification of the deacon John who wrote to Senarius with Boethius' dedicatee see C. Pietri and L. Pietri, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, ii/1, Rome 1999, 1074–5.

⁵⁹ Cyprian of Toulon, *Pervenit ad parvitatē*, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH, Epp. iii, Berlin 1892, 434–6.

⁶⁰ Maxwell, 'Christology and grace'; M. J. Pereira, 'From Augustine to the Scythian monks: social memory and the doctrine of predestination', *Studia patristica* lxx (2013), 671–83; Mathisen, 'Caesarius of Arles', 223–5. On the connection of these issues more broadly see also D. Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology in the early Church*, Oxford 2003.

⁶¹ *Vita Caesarii* i.60, ed. B. Krusch, MGH, SS rer. Merov. iii, Hanover 1896, 481–2; Mathisen, 'Caesarius of Arles', 210, 224.

following year, the Council of Orange prescribed this dogma as mandatory – quoting some *capitula* on grace and free will that seem to have been written by one of the Scythian monks.⁶² Given the apparent consonance between neo-Chalcedonian Christology and an Augustinian understanding of grace, it is not surprising that the Theopaschite chapter on Nestorianism was not only seen as incompatible with Gennadius' definition of Timotheanism, but also was never combined with his chapter on Predestinarians.

Chapter IIIa on Eutychians seems to have been the least popular chapter of the four, but it may have been written by the same author as the much more widely transmitted chapter II on Nestorians. Both start with versions of the phrase '[Nestoriani/Eutychiani] a [Nestorio/Eutyche] qui ... dogmatizare ausus est' ('Nestorians/Eutychians from Nestorius/Eutyches who dared to teach the dogma') and use the acceptance of the formula 'deus homo passus est' as a litmus test for orthodoxy.⁶³ Alternatively, it is of course possible that a later author modelled chapter IIIa after chapter II, wanting to parallel the two Christological heresies. According to chapter IIIa, instead of subscribing to the formula in question, Eutyches ascribed the suffering only to the divine Christ, since he believed that his human nature had been fully dissolved into the divine nature in the incarnation. This chapter also contains an account of Eutyches's acceptance by the synod of Ephesus in 449 and his eventual anathematisation and exile in Chalcedon in 451.⁶⁴

Chapters IIa (on Nestorians) and III (on Eutychians) may have had a different author, but they, too, seem to have been written by someone engaged in the Theopaschite controversy on the neo-Chalcedonian side. Chapters IIa and III both show some similarities with the *Disputatio de Nestorianis et Eutychianis* written by Bishop John of Tomi who, before his tenure as bishop, was one of the Scythian monks pushing for the acceptance of the 'unus-ex-trinitate' formula.⁶⁵ The last sentence of IIa was in fact taken over almost word for word from John of Tomi's *Disputatio*; the dependency of chapter III on the *Disputatio* is less obvious, but still recognisable (see Table 2).

The author of IIa also accused Nestorius of wanting to use the appellation 'anthropotocos' (from ἀνθρωποτόκος, 'bearer of man') for the virgin Mary

⁶² M. Cappuyns, 'L'Origine des «Capitula» d'Orange 529', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* vi (1934), 121–42; T. L. Humphries, *Ascetic pneumatology from John Cassian to Gregory the Great*, Oxford 2013, 137–40.

⁶³ Morin, 'A Travers', 218–19.

⁶⁴ Appendix to *De haeresibus* IIIa, 350–1.

⁶⁵ E. Schwartz, *I. Die sogenannten Gegenanathematismen des Nestorius, II: Zur Schriftstellerei Theodoret's*, Munich 1922, 9–10, and W. Bark, 'John Maxentius and the Collectio Palatina', *Harvard Theological Review* xxxvi/2 (1943), 93–107, identify him as John Maxentius, the leader and most prolific author of this group; F. Glorie, *CCSL* lxxxv A, Turnhout 1978, p. xxxviii, identifies him as the presbyter and archimandrite John who was part of the Scythian delegation to Pope Hormisdas in 520.

Table 2. *Similarities between chs 11a/111 of the appendix to De haeresibus and John of Tomi's Disputatio de Nestorianis et Eutychemiani*Appendix to *De haeresibus*, 350

[ch 11a] **'quod Catholicorum aures nequaquam ferre potuerunt, quia talis editio non unum Christum** in ueritate carnis atque deitatis, **sed geminum, quod nefas est, asserebat**'.

[ch. 111] **'Eutychemiani ab Eutyche** quodam Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae **presbytero** exorti sunt, qui **dum uideretur refutare Nestorium, in Apollinarem** Manichaeumque transiuit, et humanitatis in Christo denegans ueritatem, *quidquid a uerbo nostrae proprietatis receptum est diuinae tantummodo ascribit essentiae*, ut sacramentum salutis humanae, quod non nisi in **utraque substantia** est, *naturam* in Christo nostram negando, dissolueret stulta impietate non sentiens universo corpori auferri, quod capiti defuisset.'

John of Tomi, *Disputatio de Nestorianis et Eutychemiani*, CCSL, lxxxvA, 236–8

quam **sententiam catholici nequaquam ferre potuerunt**, quae **non unum Christum**, ex utraque natura inconfuse atque indiscrete, pronuntiat, **sed geminum, quod nefas est, asseuerat**'.

'Eutychemiani ab Eutyche nuncupati sunt, **presbytero** monasterii apud Constantinopolim constituti. ... **Apollinarem** namque contentiosum seu potius perniciosum secutus haereticum **Dum** enim nimis **Nestorio uidetur obsistere** et timet **utramque** in dei filio **substantiam** confiteri ...; *quod nostrae naturae ueraciter integreque suscepit, id totum ad deitatis eius essentiam transferre non metuit.*'

Key:

Bold = (almost) verbatim quotations

Italic = looser parallels

instead of 'theotocos' (from θεοτόκος, 'bearer of God').⁶⁶ The more common – and more accurate – accusation is that, because he did not want to ascribe the ostensibly human attribute of 'being born' to God, Nestorius rejected the 'θεοτόκος'-title in favour of 'χριστοτόκος' ('bearer of Christ'). In two sermons, though, he also suggested using both 'ἀνθρωποτόκος' and 'θεοτόκος' together.⁶⁷ These two sermons are only transmitted in a Latin translation in the so-called *Collectio Palatina* (BAV, ms Pal. lat. 234, fos 2r–113v), a collection of texts on Nestorianism compiled at least in part by one of the Scythian monks during or shortly after the Theopaschite controversy.⁶⁸ According to the epilogue of an earlier, non-extant version of the *Collectio Palatina*, now found in the middle of the collection, it originally ended with John of Tomi's *Disputatio*.⁶⁹ Thus,

⁶⁶ Appendix to *De haeresibus* 11a, 350, line 6.

⁶⁷ Nestorius of Constantinople, *Sermo xviii/xix*, ed. E. Schwartz, ACO i/5.i, Berlin–Leipzig 1924, 39–46.

⁶⁸ During the controversy according to Bark, 'John Maxentius', 104–7; between 530 and 550 according to Schwartz, ACO i/5.i, p. viii and Glorie, CCSL lxxxv A, p. xxxix.

⁶⁹ In this epilogue, the initial collector announced 'beatissimi patris nostri Iohannis Tomitanae urbis episcopi prouinciae Scythiae sermonibus' on Nestorians and

the author of chapters IIa and III most probably had this earlier recension of the *Collectio Palatina* at their disposal.

While chapter III offers a rather conventional definition of Eutychianism – Eutyches is compared to Apollinarius and Mani, in that he supposedly denied Christ's humanity⁷⁰ – chapter IIa makes a similar rhetorical move to chapter II, supplying both constructions of Nestorianism. It starts with the accusation that he believed Mary only to have borne the human Christ (hence *anthropotocos*), but instead of deducing that Nestorius denied Christ's divinity, the author concludes that he must have believed the divine Christ to be different from the one born of Mary. Therefore, he must have assumed two Christs; the issue with his Christology was that he was not able to adequately express the 'unity of the person ... and inseparable association' ('unitat[as] personae et ... societa[s] inseparabil[is]') of Christ's two natures.⁷¹ Both in content and with respect to the intertexts, then, chapter IIa specifically points to a neo-Chalcedonian origin, which explains why it seemed interchangeable with chapter II to some medieval scribes working on their respective copies of *De haeresibus*.

Augustine's *De haeresibus* was continued in multiple ways by late antique and early medieval scribes; they had the confidence to alter the text to fit their needs, adding information on the heresies that seemed like acute dangers in their days, even if they had not been in the days of Augustine – in particular on the debates around Christology that had arisen since. Far from simply piling on whatever information they could find, these continuators were aware that, depending on how they defined the Christological heresies, the same theological tradition could look either like the obvious orthodox refutation of one heresy or dangerously close to another. While one continuator seems to have opted for allowing their readers to

Eutychians; see ACO I/5.1, ed. Schwartz, 181. Already G. Morin, 'Le Témoignage perdu de Jean évêque de Tomi sur les hérésies de Nestorius et d'Eutychès', *JTS* o.s. vii/25 (1905), 74–7, argued that these *sermones* were to be identified with the *Disputatio de Nestorianis et Eutychianis*. He only knew the abridged version of the *Disputatio*; on the precedence of the long version (which was the basis for chapter IIa and III) see Glorie, CCSL lxxxvA, p. xxxix–xl. The epilogue and the long version are transmitted together (though without the rest of the *Collectio Palatina*) in Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome, MS 2010, fos 168v–169v; see CCSL lxxxv A, 231–4, right column. Interestingly, though, the short version of the *Disputatio* begins with 'INCIPIT SANCTI IOHANNIS TOMITANE ... de duabus haeresibus Nestorianorum et Eutychianistarum nuper exortis post obitum beatae memoriae Augustini' (see *ibid.* 234, left column). The explicit information that these heresies arose only after Augustine's death could suggest that at least one medieval scribe was aware of some kind of connection to *De haeresibus*.

⁷⁰ *Appendix to De haeresibus* III, p. 350, line 3–4; cf. Augustine of Hippo, *De haeresibus* 46, lines 155–6 (Manicheans), 55, lines 6–11 (Apollinarians).

⁷¹ *Appendix to De haeresibus* IIa, p. 350, quotation at lines 4–5.

make up their own mind, both Gennadius and the (two) Theopaschite continuator(s) made quite clear which theological tradition would, in their eyes, be in line with orthodox Chalcedonian Christology. Their answers were diametrically opposed, though; defining the error of the 'Timothean' miaphysites as being unable to express the difference in 'acting natures' in Christ's human and divine actions was clearly incompatible with defining Nestorianism as an insufficient understanding of the participation of Christ's divine nature in the suffering on the cross.

Combining Gennadius' chapter on Timotheans with the Theopaschite one on Nestorians in the editions of *De haeresibus* therefore muddles our understanding of how late antique and medieval people actually interacted with the text, as does leaving out the chapter on predestinarianism altogether. Ironically, the fact that the debate over the relative role of divine grace and human free will was raging again when the Maurists prepared their edition led them to make decisions that would make the fifth/sixth-century version of this same controversy less visible: at least for some, it was entirely possible to claim the authority of Augustine's name in the refutation of such heresies as Pelagianism while at the same time defining as a heresy what for others *was* Augustine's (orthodox) doctrine of grace – though at least they seemed reluctant to ascribe the definition of 'Predestinarianism' as a heresy to Augustine personally. While certainly not an automatic connection, the specific combinations of additional chapters actually transmitted in the manuscripts of *De haeresibus* also provides more evidence that many neo-Chalcedonians saw an Augustinian understanding of grace as complementary to their Christology; they thus had no qualms about claiming his name for their Christological additions.

APPENDIX

Christological additions in the manuscripts used by editors of De haeresibus between the seventeenth and the twentieth century (in alphabetical order)

Manuscript	Maurists	B-H	CCSL	Additional chapters
Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 507		n		—
Avranches, BM, MS 91, fos 254 ^v –255 ^r	<i>Michaelinus*</i>	a	D	app. II+III
Bamberg, SB, MS Patr. 22		b ₁		— [†]
Bamberg, SB, MS Patr. 24		b ₂		—
Bamberg, SB, MS Patr. 30		b ₃		—
Bamberg, SB, MS Patr. 87		B	A	—
Basle, Universitätsbibliothek, MS B.VIII.9, fos 26 ^r –27 ^r		R	F	app. II+IIIa
Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.3.25		t		—
Douai, BM, MS 275			C	app. IIa+III
Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B.IV.6 [‡]		f		—
Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS San Marco 604, fos 89 ^r –90 ^r		F ₁		app. II+IIIa
Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS San Marco 651		F ₂		—
Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, MS Aug. perg. 55			H	—
Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, MS 80			M	—
Mantua, Biblioteca Teresiana (Biblioteca Comunale), MS 213		M ₂		app. II+IIIa
Mantua, Biblioteca Teresiana (Biblioteca Comunale), MS 438, fo. 202 ^v		M ₁		app. II+III
Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, MS ex Vind. lat. 2, fo. 20 ^v		N	V [§]	app. IIa+III with slight additions**

(Cont.)

Manuscript	Maurists	B-H	CCSL	Additional chapters
Orléans, BM, MS 158, pp. 304–5	<i>Floriacensis</i> ^{††}			app. II+III
Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 248		P _a		app. II+III
Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 250, fos 71r–72r	<i>Victorinus</i> ^{††}			Genn.
Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 628, fo. 107v	<i>Dominicarum maioris conventus Parisiensis</i> ^{§§}			app. II+III
Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, MS 233			G	app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1745, fo. 27r	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i> ^{***}	P ₃		app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1797	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>	P ₇		—
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1905, fos 113v–114r	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>	P ₄		app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1908, fo. 53v	<i>Regius?</i>			app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1918, fo. 101v	<i>Regius?</i>	P ₁₀		app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1924	<i>Regius?</i>	P ₈		—
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1936, fo. 293r	<i>Regius?</i>			app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 1974, fo. 233v	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>			app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 2076, fos 86r–v	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>	P ₂		app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 2341, fo. 157v	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>	P ₁	B	app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 2528	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>	P ₉		app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 2703, fo. 14r	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>			app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 3855, fos 136v–137r	<i>Regius?</i> / <i>Colbertinus?</i>			app. II+III
Paris, BNF, MS lat. 14467		P ₆		app. II+III
Poitiers, BM, MS 64, fo. 90r–v	<i>Becheronensis</i> ^{†††}			app. II+III
Rouen, BM, MS 470		r ₁		app. II+III
Troyes, BM, MS 40 (t. 10)		d ₁		app. II+III
Troyes, BM, MS 70		d ₂	J	app. II+III
Troyes, BM, MS 610		d ₃		app. II+III
Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 414, fo. 156r	<i>Vaticanus</i> ^{†††}			app. II+III
Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 445	<i>Vaticanus</i>			—
Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 511, fo. 42r	<i>Vaticanus</i>			Genn.

(Cont.)

Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 655 ^{sss}	<i>Vaticanus</i>	—
Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1319, fo. 253r	<i>Vaticanus</i>	app. II+III

Key:

In cases where the catalogues were detailed enough and/or images of the manuscript were available, the exact folia where the additions appear have been supplied.

app = appendix to *De haeresibus*, ed. R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beukers, CCSL xlv, Turnhout 1969, 348–51.

B-H = siglum in L. Bazant-Hegemark, 'Aurelii Augustini Liber ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas, Sermo adversus Iudaeos, Liber de haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum: Text und textkritischer Apparat', unpubl. PhD diss. Vienna 1969.

CCSL = siglum in CCSL xlv, ed. R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beukers, Turnhout 1969.

Genn. = Gennadius of Marseille, *Catalogus haereticorum*, ed. F. Oehler, *Corpus Haereseologicus*, i, Berlin 1856, 297–300 (but see n. 35, above).

Maurists = siglum in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi Operum tomus octavus continens opuscula polemica adversus haereses, manichaeorum, priscillianistarum & arianorum post Lovaniensium theologorum recognitionem correctam denuo ad manuscriptos codices Gallicanos, Vaticanos &c. nec non ad editiones antiquiores & castigatiora opera et studio monachorum ordinis S. Benedicti, e congregatione S. Mauri*, ed. T. Blampin and P. Coustant, Paris 1688, repr. 1694.

(Cont.)

* Vander Plaetse and Beukers, CCSL xlv. 268–9, n. 32.

† P. Verbraken, ‘Rev: Patristic Studies, LXXXVIII à XCII’, *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* liii (1958), 864, cited by Vander Plaetse and Beukers, CCSL xlv. 350, claims that this manuscript transmits app. II+IIIa. In fact, it only contains the Augustinian text.

‡ Erroneously cited as B.IV.3.

§ Vander Plaetse and Beukers, CCSL xlv, erroneously give the shelf mark IV.A.8. They seem to have taken this mistake from A. L. Feder, *Studien zum Schriftstellerkatalog des heiligen Hieronymus*, Freiburg 1927, 24–5.

** Since the additions are transmitted before the Augustinian text – with the note ‘Hoc adiungendum est in fine sequentis libelli de heresibus’ written above –, both editors missed them entirely. At the end of the chapter on Nestorians (IIa), the manuscript adds simply ‘et multa alia blasphema praedicabat’; at the end of the chapter on Eutychians (III) ‘Item aiunt duas naturas confitemur antequam uerbum caro fieret, postea uero quam uerbum caro factum est unam naturam solum, id est uerbum, absque carne nostra et animam quam adumspit de sancta uirgine maria absque peccato. finit.’ The plural *aiunt* betrays the switch in sources, since up to this point the text refers only to Eutyches personally, not his supposed followers.

†† Vander Plaetse and Beukers, CCSL xlv. 268–9 n. 32.

†† Kukula, *Die Mauriner Ausgabe*, 67; Ouy, *Les Manuscrits*, vol. 2, 202.

‡‡ A. Molinier, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine*, vol. 1, Paris 1885, 276–7.

*** Information on the former shelf marks of these manuscripts within Jean-Baptiste Colbert’s and/or the Royal collection is available at <<https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/>>, accessed 4 Feb. 2022.

††† A. Bondéelle-Souchier, *Bibliothèques cisterciennes dans la France médiévale: Répertoire des abbayes d’hommes*, Paris 1991, 160.

††† For the shelf marks of the Vatican manuscripts used by the Maurists, see Kukula, *Die Mauriner Ausgabe*, 67. Vatican City, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 495 and 499 (listed *ibid.*) only contain the letters between Augustine and Quodvultdeus, the dedicatee of *De haeresibus*.

‡‡‡ Since a rebinding, this volume no longer transmits *De haeresibus*; see C. F. Urba, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Augustinischen Textkritik*, Vienna 1889, 61–3.