

**DE DIGNITATE CONDITIONIS HUMANAЕ: TRANSLATION,
COMMENTARY, AND RECEPTION HISTORY OF THE
DICTA ALBINI (PS.-ALCUIN) AND THE DICTA CANDIDI**

by Mette Lebech and James McEvoy with John Flood (Appendix)*

Abstract: In two MSS of the ninth century the *Dicta Albini* and the *Dicta Candidi Presbyteri de imagine Dei* are to be found fused together into a treatise named *De dignitate conditionis humanae*. Although the *Dicta Albini*, once attributed to Alcuin of York, may go back to an unknown late antique author from southern Gaul and the *Dicta Candidi* may have had a pupil of Alcuin for its author, their common theme unites them and testifies to the history of the conceptualization of human dignity. Both dicta have been critically edited by John Marenbon (1981) and are translated here for the first time. A hitherto-unnoticed source of the *Dicta Albini* in the Roman liturgy is also identified. Against the background of the study of the content of the treatise(s) it is argued that *dignitas conditionis humanae* is so close in meaning, systematically and linguistically, to the contemporary idea of human dignity that the treatise(s) should be read as part of the history of this idea. In fact our treatise(s) significantly influenced the thought of later ages. The considerable popularity which the material enjoyed is traced from Carolingian times down to the early Renaissance. Around 1450 an extensive excerpt from the *Dicta Albini* was translated into Middle English; in an appendix this version is edited from all four manuscript witnesses. All of these ramifications of the treatise(s) alert us to an often-overlooked strand in the history of the idea of human dignity.

Keywords: Pseudo-Alcuin; Pseudo-Augustine; Pseudo-Ambrose; human dignity; Munich Passages; Lollards; *Dicta Albini*; *Dicta Candidi*; *De imagine Dei*; *De dignitate conditionis humanae*; *De spiritu et anima*.

INTRODUCTION

Two brief writings attested from Carolingian times, later combined under the title *De dignitate conditionis humanae*, discussed the closely-related themes of the dignity of the creation of the human being and the image of God in the same. The first, known as *Dicta Albini de imagine Dei*, takes the form of a comment on Genesis 1.26: “Let us make man to our image and likeness.”¹ This *Dicta*² has frequently been associated with the name of Alcuin of York (whose adopted name among the learned of the Carolingian court circle was Flaccus Albinus³), but is currently regarded as

* Department of Philosophy, National University of Ireland, Maynooth, County Kildare, Ireland; School of Politics, International Studies, and Philosophy, Queen’s University Belfast, 21 University Square, Belfast BT7 1PA, Northern Ireland; Balliol College, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3BJ, UK.

¹ We employ the Douai-Rheims version of the Bible because it was based upon the Vulgate text and so is uniquely suitable for studies involving Latin biblical exegesis. The authors thank Dr. John Flood for generous promptings, learned and constructive criticism, and the fruits of his searches of Latin databases. Our thanks are due to Hugh O’Neill of Belfast for his critical reading of more than one draft of the present study, and for his valued help with proofreading.

² Though “Dicta” is a plural form we follow the practice of Marenbon (see n. 13) in treating it as a singular noun, to avoid confusion with the other Munich Passages edited by him. The word *dicta* had a wide range of meanings in medieval Latin, extending from the evident sense of “things spoken” to “Dicta Augustini” (“the Writings of Augustine”). The meanings continued to develop in the course of the Middle Ages. The *Dicta* of St. Anselm and of Robert Grosseteste, for instance, were collections of individual, unrelated written compositions of varying length, each devoted to a theme, especially of Scripture, or an *ex-emplum*. This sense would bear some degree of comparison to the later vernacular terms *essay* (Francis Bacon) *essai* (Montaigne) and even *pensée* (Pascal).

³ W. Heil, G. Bernt, and M. Folkerts, “Alcuin,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 1.417–420. See also Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Munich 1911–1931) 1.191, 273–288, 2.1, 923, 800ff.; F. Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Munich 1975) 287–288; in French translation: *Histoire de la littérature latine du moyen-âge*, t. 1: *De Cassiodore à la fin de la renaissance carolingienne*: vol. 2: *L’époque carolingienne*, rev. ed. (Turnhout 1990) 46–49 (notable for its bibliography); Giulio d’Onofrio, “La teologia carolingia,” in G. d’Onofrio, ed., *Storia della teologia nel medioevo*, vol. 1. *I principii* (Casale Monferrato 1996) 118–127. Regarding the manuscripts and editions

anonymous. A condensed fifteenth-century appreciation of its message is found in a manuscript caption: “Descriptio pulcherrima dignitatis humane”; numerous medieval readers would have rallied to that appreciation, and the treatise still has its admirers.⁴ The second writing, which in the manuscript tradition was closely associated with the first, is ascribed to Wizo (Candidus) (fl. 793–802)⁵ and is known as *Dicta Candidi Presbyteri de imagine Dei*. It prolongs the Augustinian analogy between the three Persons of the Holy Trinity and the three powers of the human mind making up the image of God in the human being—an analogy initiated by the *Dicta Albini*. As such, and as the abovementioned fifteenth-century appreciation indicates, the *Dicta Albini* can easily be understood to concern human dignity, and indeed to be the first freestanding treatise devoted to that subject.⁶

The title “De dignitate conditionis humanae” is not a bad choice for the conjoined *Dicta* either, as the phrase is taken from the first line of the *Dicta Albini* (“Tanta itaque dignitas humanae conditionis esse cognoscitur”)⁷ and merely promoted to the first line which otherwise is occupied by a scriptural quotation. Editing of this kind is required for purposes of collecting: to some extent the copying practice served the function of sorting texts into a volume and thus the addition of the title does not require any more explanation than would the heading above a library shelf.

What does require a little further explanation, however, is saying that a treatise entitled *on the dignity of the creation* (“conditio”⁸) *of the human being* is a treatise on *human dignity*. “Conditio” is probably correctly translated as “creation,” but the word nevertheless is the ancestor of our word “condition” which also carries some of the systematic meaning of the Latin term. God, of course, is the “condition” of the human being as its Creator, and is so in two senses, logical and normative. In the logical sense, God is the condition without which there would be no human being. In the normative sense, God is the condition for the human being’s capability of becoming what he is supposed to be, namely a reflection or image of God. Thus a contrasting, perhaps anachronistic, translation: “On the dignity of the human condition” would highlight

of Alcuin’s writings, the best current guide is Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540*, rev. ed. Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin 1 (Turnhout 2001) 36–46.

⁴ The manuscript in question belonged to the Carthusian monastery of Salvatorberg and was reported by Paul Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz* (Munich 1969) 2:417, 10–11. We place ourselves among the admirers of the *Dicta Albini*.

⁵ Not to be confused with his contemporary Brunn (Candidus) a monk of Fulda; see John Marenbon, “Candidus (fl. 793–802),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2004.

⁶ See Mette Lebech, *On the Problem of Human Dignity. A Hermeneutical and Phenomenological Investigation* (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2009) chap. 2.

⁷ The phrase “omnis dignitas humanae conditionis” occurs in the Psalms commentary of Pope Gregory the Great. Upon examination however the usage refers to social condition, and hence to *dignity* in the conventional sense, which is not of interest to our exploration of *human* dignity. Gregory the Great, *In VII Psalmos Poenitentiales Expositio*, PL 79.549–660; see, in particular, cols. 617–618, on the fifth penitential psalm (Ps. 101.16) “For every height of this world bows in reverence for Christ. Every dignity of human condition inclines itself in obedience to Christ” (Phil. 2.8–11). Our translation.

⁸ Meanings given to “conditio” in Christian Latin include creation (action of creating, cf. “conditor,” the Creator); creature; state of the creature; condition (cf. “condicio”); nature; disposition of materials; social condition, inferior condition, e.g., slavery); A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Turnhout 1954) 192.

the work's logical context, and underline that the treatise does indeed concern what we term "human dignity," i.e., the fundamental value of the human being.⁹ This translation implies that it is dignified, i.e., fundamentally valuable, to live as a human being and to be a human being because one has been created as one. And as this is what our treatise(s) attempt(s) to bring out, it is as good a translation as "on the dignity of the creation of the human being," especially because the latter translation puts an emphasis on the creation in a manner that seems extrinsic to the human being, whereas the treatise really concerns this creation as it is active in and intrinsic to the life of the human individual created in, and to, the image of God.

We might today be tempted to overlook the logical context of the treatise(s). To the early medievals, however, *dignitas* meant not only high office, but also "firstness" as exemplified in a basic principle, an axiom. Boethius used the term *dignitas* accordingly: on the one hand it meant authority or high office, which he claimed (in *De consolatione Philosophiae*) ought to rely on moral integrity,¹⁰ and on the other hand it referred to first principles or rendered the term axiom (in his translation of the *Posterior Analytics* of Aristotle). He would not be the only translator to render *axiomata* by *dignitates*, for the versions of the Aristotelian work printed in Aristoteles Latinus follow the practice of Boethius in this regard.¹¹ *Dignitas* thus seems to have meant something which was supposed to command respect; something deserving of respect—something which was regarded as being "of consequence," as Jane Austen would say. That particular meaning of dignity has been lost in the transition to modern languages.¹² It remains the case that "dignity" still carries an implicit logical sense, one which perhaps is brought out most clearly through the concept of human dignity. What we understand by human dignity is in fact the idea that human beings as such ought to command respect; that they have unconditional (highest) value, deserve respect and are "of consequence," i.e. that they "count"—every one of them, in virtue of themselves—just as a logical principle is applicable in all cases, or is of consequence wherever it applies. What is striking about the treatise under investigation is that it quite consciously employs *dignitas* in *both* its logical *and* its ethico/political sense, and applies it to the human being as such. It is also remarkable for its association of *dignitas* and *imago dei*, something that is far less frequent in the Middle Ages than one might imagine.

In summary, therefore, *De dignitate conditionis humanae* may be translated as "On the dignity of the human creation," though this should not conceal the fact that the treatise concerns what we call human dignity, and furthermore treats of this subject in

⁹ The expression "human dignity" only really became current after the Second World War. For a history of the expression see Lebeck, *Problem of Human Dignity* (n. 6 above) part I.

¹⁰ Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, ed. J. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand (London and Cambridge, MA 1973) 209–213 (II.6).

¹¹ The later versions were by James of Venice (?1125–1150, with 275 MSS); Ioannes (before 1159, 1 MS); Gerard of Cremona (before 1187, 3 MSS) and William of Moerbeke (ca. 1269 or earlier, 4 MSS); see Bernard G. Dod, "Aristoteles Latinus" *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. Norman Kretzmann, A. J. P. Kenny and Jan Pinborg (Cambridge 1982) 74–75.

¹² The word "principle," however, has retained some similar connotations. We use it about a logical principle, but we also talk about a school "principal," and we can even regard "prince" as being etymologically linked to it.

a very interesting manner. That it concerns human dignity, or the fundamental value of the human being as such, is indeed the systematic justification for the combination of the *Dicta Albini* and the *Dicta Candidi*, the latter being concerned with the image of God in the human being, and the former addressing the act of creating the human being as an act in which God consults himself and initiates communication with this special creature that thereby is graced with a threefold dignity.

Both treatises, Ps.-Alcuin's in particular, knew a wide diffusion during the Middle Ages and carried the central idea to the minds of many readers over a period of seven centuries and more, down to the Renaissance. Both have been edited, but neither has hitherto been translated into modern English.¹³ The aim of our study is to offer an appreciation of the content and influence of the two writings (Part I) and to provide an English translation of them (Part II). In the first part we concentrate our efforts more upon the *Dicta Albini* than on the *Dicta Candidi*, as the former is systematically the more important and was in fact more influential. The edition and study of the Middle English version of a lengthy quotation from the *Dicta Albini*, edited by John Flood, forms part of this research (see Appendix).

PART I: THE DICTA AND THEIR DIFFUSION BEFORE PRINTING

We first discuss the authorship question (1–2), a likely liturgical source (3), the transmission history of the manuscripts (4), and the use of the *Dicta Albini* during Carolingian times (5), before we turn to the content of the composite version (6). Then we describe the later history of the influence of the treatise(s) in “sentences” associated with the School of Laon (7); in the compilation *De spiritu et anima* (8), and in the philosophy of Robert Grosseteste (9).

1. The Authorship question regarding the *Dicta Albini de imagine Dei*

The title “*Dicta Albini de imagine Dei*” carried by the oldest manuscript witness (Munich MS clm 6407, ca. 800) designates Alcuin as the author of the short text, which has in consequence frequently been associated with his name.¹⁴ The Alcuinian authorship of the *Dicta Albini*, defended at one point by its editor, John Marenbon, as “almost certain,”¹⁵ was challenged in 1982 by the late Donald A. Bullough.¹⁶ The latter

¹³ The two *Dicta* together with related material have been edited by John Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre: Logic, Theology and Philosophy in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1981). For the two editions see Appendix 1, 149–166. The authors pay tribute to the exceptional quality and range of the information assembled by Marenbon relative to the *Dicta Albini* and the *Dicta Candidi*, as well as to the critical value of his edition of what he calls the Munich Passages.

¹⁴ The *Dicta Albini* appears in PL 101.565–567 under title *Dicta Beati Albini Levitae* (the last word is a reference to Alcuin's life-long status as a deacon). This edition gives a good text based upon three MSS: Munich clm 6407 (the oldest copy, from Verona via Freising); Vienna 458 (from Salzburg) and a St. Emmeram codex which does not appear on the list of Marenbon—or is disguised there; it could conceivably be one of the two Munich MSS he lists which are now in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek but reached there from Tegernsee Abbey: Munich clm 18961, or Munich clm 19135. This PL edition has the text of the *Dicta Albini* without the interpolation (see below).

¹⁵ For the discussion of the authenticity of the *Dicta Albini* and the *Dicta Candidi* see Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 33–40, 43. Bibliographical items relative to authenticity and textual tradition of both writings are to be found in Iohannis Machielsen, ed., *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, CCSL 2B (Turnhout 1994) nos. 3008, 3008a, 3008b.

argued on the basis of lexical usage and other literary features that the Alcuin of before 790 was unlikely to have been the author of the *Dicta* attributed to him, and also that Alcuin did not begin to produce original work until after that date, which marks the first known influence of the *Dicta*.¹⁷ Marenbon came round to the view that the argument of his adversary was convincing.¹⁸ Bullough himself arrived at the conclusion that the origins of the *Dicta Albini* probably lay in the late fifth or early sixth century, perhaps in Southern Gaul. Like Bullough, we shall refer to the anonymous author as “Ps.-Alcuin.”

The question of authorship has been a matter of controversy down the centuries. A manuscript of the twelfth century, the Berlin MS Deutsche Staatsbibliothek 181 (copied at Reims) carries the title-attribution (“*Dicta Albini*”), as does the Munich manuscript already referred to. The same holds true of the Vienna MS Staatsbibliothek 458. From the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, however, the treatise either circulated anonymously (3 MSS) or was mistakenly attributed to St. Augustine and considered to be a sermon (24 MSS¹⁹). The text of the *Dicta Albini* was copied in a ninth-century codex as book IV of the *De officiis* of St. Ambrose.²⁰ In the fifteenth century the attribution to St. Ambrose is carried by a manuscript from Amorbach (Würzburg, MS Universitätsbibliothek M.ch.q.159, A.D. 1456/7). Trithemius repeated this attribution in his catalogue (1494), placing it between the Saint’s *Hexaëmeron* and *De Paradiso*, as also did a manuscript copied in England in 1504 (Oxford, MS Bodleian Douce 100). In the sixteenth century it was published among Augustine’s works under the title *De creatione primi hominis*, but this attribution was firmly and decisively rejected by Erasmus, and also by the Louvain editors of Augustine’s works. The Maurists printed it in part only, following the works of Augustine (PL 40.1213–1214); they were aware that it had been published among the writings of Ambrose. One finds it under the latter’s name in Migne (PL 17.1105–1107). The same collection also included it as a writing of Alcuin. The *Dicta Albini* shared the fate of numerous other writings of the Middle Ages, in that once its pseudonymous character was demonstrated it lost an appreciable part of the credit it had hitherto enjoyed. On the

¹⁶ D. A. Bullough, “Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven,” in D.A. Bullough, *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester 1991) 178–181. See also Donald Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (Leiden 2004) 6, 72, 376.

¹⁷ Two quotations from the *Dicta Albini* have been identified in the so-called *Libri Carolini*, composed ca. 791/2. Once thought to be from the pen of Alcuin, this work is currently attributed to Theodulph of Orleans. Marenbon suggests that it was from the *Libri Carolini* that Alcuin drew his awareness of the *Dicta*, and adds that the treatise “echoed many of his own close concerns and so, not only did he use it in his writing, he also appropriated it as “his” dicta (rather as he put himself forward as the rediscoverer of the *Categoriae Decem*, although they had been used in the *Libri Carolini*),” John Marenbon, “Alcuin, the Council of Frankfort and the Beginnings of Medieval Philosophy,” in Rainer Berndt, ed., *Das Frankfurter Konzil von 794*, 2 vols. (Mainz 1997) 2.614

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 2.603–615.

¹⁹ The total of 24 includes the four manuscripts witnessing the text of the Middle English translation of the *Dicta Albini*.

²⁰ So wrote Prof. Bullough. See Dabney Anderson Bankert, Jessica Wegmann, and Charles D. Wright, *Ambrose in Anglo-Saxon England with pseudo-Ambrose and Ambrosiaster*, Old English Newsletter Subsidia (Kalamazoo 1997) 64.

other hand this loss of canonical status did not altogether deprive it of a readership in Renaissance and early modern times.

The fact that the *Dicta* is no longer assigned to Alcuin does not mean that it has no connection with the Carolingian scholar and his circle. Bullough encouraged scholars to regard the work as “a late-Patristic one, which resurfaced at the Court and was subsequently exploited by Alcuin and his pupils.”²¹ Alcuin, in other words, became aware (or was made aware—one cannot say which) of the writing in the course of his wide reading in the ever-expanding Court book-collection. He recognized its worth and, together with members of his circle, gave the treatise a currency it had never known before his time. By the year 800 or so the disciples of Alcuin at Tours may have already regarded the writing as Alcuin’s own work.

To the manuscripts of the fifteenth century which witness the text of the *Dicta Albinii* and which are mentioned in Marenbon’s work we may add a further item, namely the Munich MS Staatsbibliothek clm 8827. This codex, a paper book of extracts from the Church Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, has 423 folios. It was copied early in the fifteenth century by one Frater Andreas, a Franciscan of the South German Province, and was in the possession of Johann Haydl O.F.M., the guardian of the Franciscan convent at Munich, ca. 1440. All but the first two lines of the text of the *Dicta Albinii* is witnessed in this manuscript (fols. 256r–257r).²² The text is headed, “Ex sermone b[ea]ti augustini de ymagine et similitudine exceptus,” and begins, “Non solo iubentis sermone ut alia sex opera sed consilio sancte trinitatis et opere maiestatis divine creatus est homo, ut ex prime condicionis honore intelligeret quantum [filio *del.*] suo conditori /256v/ deberet.” It closes: “Quapropter quisque adigencius [*recte diligentius*] attendat prime sue condicionis excellentiam et verendam [*recte venerandam*] sancte trinitatis in se ipso ymaginem agnoscat, honoremque similitudinis divine ad quam creatus est morum nobilitate exercitior [*recte exercitatione*] virtutum dignitate meritorum honore contendat ut quando apparuerit tunc similis ei appareat qui eum mirabiliter ad similitudinem suam in primo adam condidit mirabilius in se ipso reformauit. Explicit.” This is followed by excerpts from “Augustinus de vita christiana.” The attribution of the *Dicta Albinii* to St. Augustine was general in the fifteenth century. This extract was most likely taken from the treatise *De spiritu et anima* (chap. 35), of which we shall say more later. The accidental nature of its identification suggests that more such discoveries are still to be made.

2. The authorship of the *Dicta Candidi Presbyteri de imagine Dei*

The story of the *Dicta Candidi* runs parallel in several ways to that just recounted. The title includes an attribution. The early Munich manuscript to which we have alluded (clm 6407) already places the *Dicta Candidi* (under that title) immediately after the *Dicta Albinii*. A tenth-century manuscript of Corbie (Paris, MS BnF lat. 13953) carries the same attribution. There has been some discussion concerning the identity of “Candidus.” Opinions were divided between Wizo, who was a pupil of Alcuin, and Bruun

²¹ Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (n. 16 above) 6.

²² The *Dicta Candidi* is not included in the extract.

(or Bronn), a monk of Fulda and pupil of Einhard. But when it was shown (by Heinz Löwe in 1943) that the oldest manuscript of the collection containing the *Dicta Candidi* as well as the *Dicta Albini* should be placed ca. 800, scholarly opinion shifted decisively towards Wizo, who was at that time already an adult whereas Bruun was only a child.²³ Wizo (OE [H]witto, Hwita, Hwitao; meaning “White,” hence the Latin nickname “Candidus”) was at first at Lindisfarne but joined Alcuin at the Carolingian court, probably in the year 793. He was closely associated with Alcuin, undertaking more than one journey at his behest (he traveled to Salzburg, where he taught, and twice to Rome), and representing him at the court while Alcuin himself was living in retirement as Abbot of Tours—even though Alcuin was not a monk nor a priest but in deacon’s orders. Wizo (Candidus) died around 805. Several theological works have been attributed to him.²⁴

Though he was later to change his position, Marenbon argued in 1982 on the basis of manuscript evidence that Alcuin must have composed his *Dicta* before 791; that Candidus, his disciple and close friend, conceived his own *Dicta* as a complement to that of his master and based it upon the same source, Augustine’s *De Trinitate*; and that the Munich Passages²⁵ must have been assembled not later than 801. Furthermore Marenbon maintained that a good argument can be made for the unity of authorship of the other thirteen elements in the Munich Passages, all of which he edited; and he put forward Candidus as the likely author of the whole set. Candidus, he suggested, completed them and added the *Dicta Albini* before 800, the likely date of the copying at Verona of what is now the Munich MS clm 6407.²⁶

In 1997 François Dolbeau published a discovery which he made in a manuscript copied at Mainz ca. 830–850.²⁷ It witnesses the text of three of the Munich Passages (nos. II, III and X) and attributes their content to Augustine. While this attribution cannot be sustained (the passages consist of mostly Augustinian material which clearly has been reworked), the discovery provides convincing evidence that this material is older than the collection of the Munich Passages, and that these cannot be regarded as the work of a single author but should be viewed as a regrouping of heterogeneous material around the three portions present in the Mainz manuscript. Dolbeau has moreover identified the same three passages, occurring in the same order, in a Vatican codex of the tenth century. Only the single *Dicta* actually ascribed to Candidus (n. VIII in Marenbon’s edition) might actually have been written by him. The two *Dicta* (“Albini” and “Candidi”) are linked by a common theme, by their

²³ Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 33.

²⁴ C. E. Eder, “Candidus,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 2.1432–1433. Eder has signaled a study of Wizo’s claim to the authorship of several works.

²⁵ These consist of fifteen passages on various theological subjects (the Trinity, the existence of God, the ten Categories, and exercises in syllogistic method) that are found all together in the Munich, Staatsbibliothek clm MS 6407 (ca. 800) and also individually or in groupings in a variety of other manuscripts. They have been critically edited by J. Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 155–166 and studied in the same work.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 42–43.

²⁷ François Dolbeau, “Le *Liber XXI Sententiarum*” *Recherches Augustiniennes* 30 (1997) 113–165; see “Annexe: Un état primitif des *Dicta Candidi*?” (162–165).

relationship to a common source, the *De Trinitate* of St. Augustine, and by the early manuscript tradition.

3. An unnoticed liturgical source of the *Dicta Albini*

The edition by Marenbon includes a useful apparatus of sources, drawing the reader's attention to the derivation of certain motifs in the *Dicta Albini* from works by Ambrose, Augustine, Claudianus Mamertus, and Gennadius of Marseilles. In particular, the striking idea that the persons of the Holy Trinity took counsel as it were among themselves before deciding upon the creation of the human being is traced to its sources in the *Hexaëmeron* of St. Basil and the *De Genesi ad Litteram* of St. Augustine.²⁸ However, a prominent liturgical source has hitherto escaped notice. In the final lines of his *Dicta Ps.-Alcuin* employs the language of a well-known ancient prayer, according to which the dignity of the human being derives from its manner of being created and has been renewed through redemption. He remarks that God created the human being, "wonderfully to his likeness in the first Adam, and more wonderfully restored it in the second."²⁹ These words echo a Christmas prayer which is found in the so-called Leonine Sacramentary.³⁰ In the Germanic adaptation of the Roman Rite the prayer was inserted into the Offertory of the Mass by means of the interpolation of a reference to "the mystery of this water and wine." The original prayer was included in several of the Roman Sacramentaries. From the thirteenth century onwards (at the latest) it formed part of the Mass and remained so until the liturgical changes made in the 1960s.³¹

4. Transmission history

The treatise(s) and the ideas transmitted in it (them) achieved significant circulation and were received by numerous readers. With it/them came the diffusion of the idea of human dignity, or at least of its "proto-idea." Marenbon depicted the diffusion of the *Dicta* along with the other "Munich Passages";³² we now take up the story he sketched, adding what we can; aware, however, that the picture we present is a provisional one which further identifications in the manuscript literature may alter.

The *Dicta Albini* and the *Dicta Candidi* have known a long association. As we have seen, they were brought together in the earliest manuscript witness and copied along with other material to a total of fifteen texts of varying length known nowadays as the Munich Passages. Each of the two *Dicta* originated separately from the collection. The *Dicta Albini* was to know a wide diffusion, and the *Dicta Candidi* a much lesser but still respectable one, whereas the collection of fifteen texts had only a

²⁸ To these sources should be added Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*, IX, 49.75, PL 75.900A–B. It is less likely that Ps.-Alcuin was aware of the same idea in Gregory of Nyssa, *De opificio hominis*, ed. G. H. Forbes (Burntisland 1855–1861) 125–127 (3.1–2).

²⁹ "mirabiliter ad similitudinem suam in primo Adam condidit, mirabilisque in secundo reformavit."

³⁰ Also known as the *Veronense* (after Verona *MS Bibl. Capit.* 85, 2nd third of the 6th c.); L. C. Mohlberg OSB, ed., *Sacramentarium Veronense*, 2nd ed. (Rome 1966) 157 (no. 1239).

³¹ The history of this prayer is explored by M. Lebech and J. McEvoy in a forthcoming article, "A Latin Liturgical Source for the Concept of Human Dignity."

³² Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 144–148.

limited circulation. The circulation-history of the two *Dicta* as it is currently known can be briefly surveyed, beginning with the *Dicta Albini*.³³

As was said above, the oldest witness to the text of the *Dicta Albini* is dated to ca. 800, anticipating the death of Alcuin himself (804). Textual features make it clear that it is a copy, not the original. During the early ninth century the work is witnessed twice in independent circulation, though without any attribution (Rome, MS Bibl. Padri Maristi, AII,1; Vatican, MS Vaticanus Pal. Lat 1719). A tenth-century MS, Vienna 458, incorporates both *Dicta* and carries the attribution to Albinus for the first one. In the twelfth century the scribe of the Berlin MS Deutsche Staatsbibliothek 181 copied the *Dicta Albini* on its own and with its proper title.

Regarding the *Dicta Candidi*, the association with the other Munich Passages proves to be stronger than with the *Dicta Albini*. The two *Dicta* appear together in the oldest manuscript (Munich, MS clm 6407). At some point in time between the years 835 and 870 the Würzburg MS Theol. fol. 56 witnessed the *Dicta Candidi* anonymously, in letter form. A ninth-century codex, Munich MS clm 18961, places the writing anonymously within the Munich passages, omitting the *Dicta Albini* and two others. An attribution to Candidus accompanies the text in the tenth-century Paris BnF 13953, which omits the *Dicta Albini* (together with one other element of the Munich Passages).

In summary, from ca. 800 the *Dicta Albini* can be found, sometimes with its title and sometimes anonymously, sometimes copied on its own and sometimes in association with the *Dicta Candidi*. However, the contents of the *Dicta Albini* were made available in adapted forms, to which we shall now turn our attention.

5. Use of the *Dicta Albini* during Carolingian times

Motifs taken from the *Dicta Albini* appeared in writings by Alcuin and authors who were roughly his contemporaries, and thus they were made more widely available. A book of questions and answers on Genesis is attributed to Alcuin and is printed among his works.³⁴ Most of the answers given in this lengthy catechism are scarcely longer than the questions put by Singulfus, the disciple of Alcuin and his pupil in the study of exegesis. We translate the short passage in which ideas familiar from the *Dicta Albini* turn up, including that of the dignity (*nobilitas*) of the human creature:

Q. 36: Why is it only of man that it was said, “Let us make man” [Gen 1.26], whereas concerning the other creatures one reads, “God spoke”? A. It was in order that it should be clear that when this creature capable of reason was created it was done by taking counsel, and that the noble nature of it should be made manifest.

Q. 37: Why did he say “Let us make,” in the plural? A. That the one operation of the three Persons should be made manifest.

Q. 38: In what is the human being the image of the Creator? A. In the interior man.

Q. 39: Why both image and likeness? A. Image in eternity, likeness in right conduct.

³³ The greater part of the information in what follows can be found in *ibid.* 149–150.

³⁴ *Interrogationes et Responsiones in Genesin*, PL 100.515ff.

Q. 40: Why did he say again, “God created man to his image,” when he had said beforehand “to Our image”? A. In order that both the plurality of Persons and the unity of the essence should be conveyed.³⁵

This passage epitomizes an exegetical idea that had reached Ambrose from St. Basil, and which Augustine, and (under their combined influence) the Venerable Bede, had incorporated into the exegesis of Genesis 1.26.³⁶ The *Dicta Albini* §1 made the notion of the Trinity’s “taking counsel” before making the creature marked by dignity, into a central element in the account it gave of human dignity (i.e. of the dignity of the human creation).

A catechization of Christian truth also went under the name of Alcuin.³⁷ Its first chapter lists the works of the six days, and in chapter 2 the creation of the human being is considered (*De natura hominis*), beginning with the query, “Q. How was man created?” to which the answer is given “The dignity of the human being’s creation is known to be so great ... that he did not bestow it upon any other creature.”³⁸ There follows in question and answer form a summary of most of *De imagine*, including the parallel between the soul and God; the image of the Trinity in the three *dignitates* of the soul; the active response that is expected of the mind regarding the Creator, through remembering and loving him; the “likeness,” imitating at the human level the virtues of God himself. The concluding lines of the dialogue are taken from *De imagine*: “Who in the first Adam made you marvelously to his likeness, and in the second even more marvelously reshaped [you].”³⁹

Writing against Felix in the Adoptionist controversy Alcuin again evoked the exegesis of Genesis 1.26, this time to argue that Jesus Christ is both God and man, since the biblical text uses the plural *faciamus* and thus refers the creation of the human being to both Father and Son.⁴⁰ This borrowing from the *De Trinitate* of St. Augustine made a pertinent addition to Alcuin’s argumentation.

³⁵ “Inter[rogatio] 36. Quare de solo homine dictum est: ‘Faciamus hominem’ [Gen 1.26]; de aliis autem creaturis legitur: ‘Dixit Deus’? –Resp. Ut videlicet, quae rationabilis creatura condebatur, cum consilio facta videretur, et ut ejus nobilitas ostenderetur. Inter. 37. Cur plurali numero dixit: ‘Faciamus’? –Resp. Ut ostenderetur trium una operatio personarum. Inter. 38. In quo est homo conditoris sui imago? –Resp. In interiori homine. Inter. 39. Cur utrumque, imago et similitudo? –Resp. Imago in aeternitate, similitudo in moribus. Inter. 40. Cur iterum dixit: ‘Creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam’, cum antea dixisset: ‘ad imaginem nostram’? –Resp. Ut utrumque, et pluralitas personarum, et unitas substantiae insinuaretur.” PL 100.520.

³⁶ Consult the source references in the footnotes to Marenbon’s edition of the *Dicta Albini, From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 158.

³⁷ *Disputatio Puerorum per Interrogationes et Responsiones*. PL 101.1101–1103. Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (n. 16 above), regards this work as pseudonymous, but we prefer to follow Richard Sharpe who accepts its authenticity. See Sharpe, *Handlist* (n. 3 above) 45.

³⁸ “Secundum quod legi, faciam quod petisti. Tanta dignitas humanae conditionis esse cognoscitur ... quod nulli alio ex creaturis donavit.”

³⁹ “qui te mirabiliter ad similitudinem suam in primo Adam condidit, mirabilisque in secundo reformavit. Haec de imagine et similitudine habeto.”

⁴⁰ “Et [Augustinus] post pauca: ‘Proinde in forma Dei fecit hominem, in forma servi factus est homo. Nam si Pater tantum sine Filio fecisset hominem, non scriptum esset, *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*. Ergo quia forma Dei accepit formam servi, utrumque Deus, utrumque homo ...’” PL 101.135D.

The *Libri Carolini* quotes more than half of the *Dicta Albini*. It omits the first paragraph and begins with §2, continuing into §4 and ending with the words “sui conditoris gerit similitudinem.”⁴¹ The quotation is made anonymously. The ideas that attracted the attention of the author/compiler of the *Libri* included the microcosmic analogy between God’s omnipresence in the creation and that of the soul in every part of the body, a presence which makes the human being to be in the image of God. They also included the psychological analogies, so familiar from the *De Trinitate* of St. Augustine, between the three capacities of the soul referred to by our treatise as “dignitates” and the three Persons of the divine Trinity. The first paragraph of the *Dicta Albini*, which includes the theme of the dignity of the human creation (condition) by the Trinity, was omitted.⁴²

To these uses of the *Dicta Albini* several additions can be made. In his commentary on Ecclesiastes, Hrabanus Maurus included a lengthy quotation from the central portion of *De imagine*.⁴³ A missionary to the Slavs likewise quoted from the text.⁴⁴ So did Paulinus, who was patriarch of Aquileia from before 787 until his death in 802, and who was a master at the court of Charlemagne in 776. The emperor conferred privileges on the Church of Aquileia in 792.⁴⁵ His *Liber exhortationis* addressed to Count Henry is a spiritual and moral mirror of the prince.⁴⁶ Paulinus chose to open his treatise with a summary of the *De imagine* (“Hominis in creatione praerogativae”) couched in letter form:

You, dearest brother, should understand that you have been created by the counsel of the Holy Trinity ... from the honor of your making (*conditio*) learn how much you owe to your Creator ... and love him more ardently, the more you grasp how wonderfully you are made ... Only to the human being is it granted to be in the image and likeness of the Creator; the image of the unity and Trinity of God which your soul has in itself lies in life and consciousness, and in the three *dignitates* you have from Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, namely intellect, will and memory; with these transcendent capacities we are to love the Creator ... do not deface the image through the advice of your friends or secular ambition ... May the grace of God go with you.⁴⁷

⁴¹ Hubertus Bastgen, ed., *Libri Carolini, sive, Caroli Magni Capitulare de imaginibus*, MGH Legum: III Concilia II-suppl. (Hannover 1924) 22–23. The quotation was collated by Marenbon along with the manuscripts: *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 159–160.

⁴² Marenbon (ibid. 35) weighed up possible answers to the question why Theodulph should have used material from Alcuin (anonymously) in the *Libri Carolini*. On present evidence it seems better to conclude that it was the use made by Theodulph of the already-existing writing *On the Image* that awakened the interest of Alcuin in the latter.

⁴³ PL 109.763–1126, in particular 874B–875B.

⁴⁴ Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 42 n. 59. Several Byzantine princesses at the court could have been the transmitters.

⁴⁵ R. Härtel, “Paulinus, Patriarch von Aquileia,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 6.1814–1815.

⁴⁶ PL 99.197ff.

⁴⁷ Paulinus of Aquileia, *Liber Exhortationis*, PL 99.199: Chap. 2, Hominis in creatione praerogativae. “Tu vero, frater charissime, intellige quia consilio sanctae Trinitatis, et opere majestatis divinae creatus es, ex primoque conditionis honore intellige quantum debeas Conditori tuo, dum tantum mox in conditione dignitatis privilegium praestitit tibi Conditor aeternus, ut tanto eum ardentius amares, quanto mirabiliorem te ab eo esse conditum intelligeres.” Chap. 3, Imago Dei quomodo in homine. “Nec hoc solum quod consilio sanctae Trinitatis sic excellenter a Conditore conditus es, sed etiam quod ad imaginem et similitudinem suam ipse Creator omnium te creavit, quod nulli alii ex creaturis nisi soli homini concessit. Et haec est imago unitatis et trinitatis omnipotentis Dei, quam anima tua habet in se: primum quia secundum Dei donum

Reference is also made to the “*dignitas humanae originis*” in a homily attributed to St. John Chrysostom, but published among the sermons of the Venerable Bede. The reference is not unimportant from our point of view.⁴⁸ In this work the dignity of the origin of the human being is said to be “easy to acknowledge” when one takes into account the transcendence of the Creator; the heavenly hand quickened into a living substance the creature whom the Divine Craftsman was going to place over the remainder of his handiwork; it was to single it out that he made the human being with intrinsic dignity, granting it power to rule over all the animals and to govern them. However, by refusing to serve the Creator the human being denied to its maker the obedience it itself claimed from the other living creatures, and so fell into the contradiction of sin.⁴⁹

6. The composite version: the *Dicta Albini* and *Dicta Candidi* combined

The story we have told thus far of the diffusion of the *Dicta Albini*, in particular, and of its penetration into theological writing has covered the period immediately following its putative rediscovery (ca. 791). We must now focus upon a new development in the history of the transmission of the *Dicta Albini*. In 1987 D. A. Bullough produced a welcome surprise by identifying two manuscripts of the ninth century which witness the text of both *Dicta* in a composite or conflated form which was destined for considerable popularity.⁵⁰ At a time unknown an anonymous writer made a composite text from the two *Dicta* by the simple means of sandwiching the *Dicta Candidi* in between the *Dicta Albini*'s discussion of the image of God (*imago Dei*) and his likeness (*similitudo Dei*).⁵¹ This decision, however it was arrived at, resulted in the treatise which came to be known as *De dignitate conditionis humanae* and which was cast in the form of a letter. As we remarked above, the version thus constituted was to be printed among the works of St. Ambrose in editions from the Renaissance down to that printed in Migne. In translating the two *Dicta* we have thought it right to separate them once again and thus to restore to each its presumably original identity; at the same time the reader who for purposes of historical fidelity wishes to peruse them in the sandwich form has only to change over from one to the other in the way indicated

vivis ac sapis, secundum quia ad imaginem tui conditoris creatus es; tertium licet unus appelleris homo, tamen tres habes a Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu sancto concessas dignitates, id est intellectum, voluntatem et memoriam.”

⁴⁸ One piece of evidence concerning its circulation has turned up: the Constitutions of the Arrouaise Canons Regular laid down the reading at the vigils of Septuagesima Sunday of the “sermo Sancti Iohannis Dignitas humanae originis.” L. Milis and J. Becquet, eds., *Canonicorum regularium Ordinis Arroasiensis constitutiones. De septuagesima*. CCCM 20 (Brepols 1970) cap. 52, linea 2.

⁴⁹ PL 95.1205–1206 (*inter Opera Bedae Homilia LX*). “Quomodo primus homo toti praelatus sit creaturae.” (Ex Operibus beati Chrysostomi) “Dignitas humanae originis facile agnoscitur, considerata sublimitate auctoris. Neque enim facile poterat esse vel leve quod manus sacra confinxit et coelestis manus in vitalem substantiam animavit, maxime cum idem artifex Deus potestatem suam in omnem fabricam eidem homini fuerat traditurus, ut quem secundum praesidem post se facere disponebat, eundem faceret plenum atque perfectum, habentem in se et dignitatem qua praecelleret, et potestatem qua cunctis animantibus imperaret, soli serviens illi a quo ei cuncta fuerant subjugata, ut imperareret mundo, serviret Deo ...”

⁵⁰ Unfortunately he does not seem to have published the references in question.

⁵¹ Heinz Löwe surmised in 1943 that the two *Dicta* were not independent writings but extracts from a treatise *De dignitate conditionis humanae* attributed in Carolingian times to Ambrose of Milan. Marenbon has acknowledged that he himself was mistaken in maintaining that the composite version (*De dignitate conditionis humanae*) originated only in the 12th c.; *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 33.

in the apparatus to our translation, in order to regain the effect intended by the adapting hand.

The Paris MS BnF lat. 1941, dating to the twelfth or thirteenth century, does not attribute either part of the treatise *De dignitate* to any author. It has however some light to throw upon the transmission of the composite form of the two *Dicta*. Regarding the portion of text common to the original and the composite version of the *Dicta Albini*, some of the variant readings reveal ways in which the latter simplified the former or misread it, or else incorporated existing copying errors. The variants have been recorded in the apparatus to our English version, to which the reader is referred in connection with the following brief discussion.

Regarding the analogy drawn between the three “dignitates” of the soul and the persons of the divine Trinity (§2), the author of the *Dicta Albini* concludes with the words “as anyone can easily understand”; for the adaptor this must have appeared too sanguine, for he restricted the claim to “anyone wise” (apparatus, n. 5). In the same paragraph a set of two verbs which should be in the subjunctive mood are instead given in indicative forms in a way that flattens the original meaning: “As much as [God] may be known” (*intelligatur*, subjunctive) and “as much as [God] may be loved” (*diligatur*, subj.) lose part of the sense of divine transcendence which the subjunctive mood conveys. According to the composite version “the likeness [of the human being to the Creator] can be detected in the things of lesser importance” (§4); but “in minoribus” is simply a disastrous variant for “in moribus,” meaning in conduct that is free and right or virtuous.⁵² Finally (and in the same context) the virtuous person is described as being “proprius Deo,” which we have rendered “special to God”; the false reading found in the adaptation at this point, namely “propius” (“something closer”) was no doubt introduced deliberately in view of the context, which is that of likeness to the Creator.

The composite version makes a change in format, in that it recasts the material in the form of a letter addressed to a “most loved son.” It may be recalled that the *Dicta Candidi* had received the same treatment in an earlier century.⁵³ The recasting did not change the text but respected its full content. The composite version added to the circulation of the two *Dicta*, while at the same time these continued to be copied separately into the sixteenth century. The text under investigation is thus structured as two independent entities, joined by the insertion of the *Dicta Candidi* between the two halves of the *Dicta Albini* and headed by a title: *De dignitate conditionis humanae*. The two halves of the *Dicta Albini* are distinguishable, since the first concerns the image and the second the likeness, to which the human being is created.

THE *Dicta Albini*

The *Dicta Albini*, as we have remarked, is structured in two equal parts, one of which concerns the human being as created in the image of God (§1–3), while the other re-

⁵² Apparatus n. 105.

⁵³ In the Würzburg *MS Theol. Fol. 56*; see Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 41.

lates to the human being created to the likeness of God (§4–6). We shall comment on each of the paragraphs separately to facilitate the study of the text itself.

§1 Here the importance of human beings is underlined by recalling that the Trinity is involved as a “We” in creating them. The Trinity, in other words, is personally involved in that each of the three Persons contributes their image, so that the human being can be created in “Our image,” and indeed each human reflects a Trinitarian structure. Thus human beings right from the start are important to someone, in fact one might say “to some Three” who, in signing their creation with their threefold image, all agree about this importance. The Council of the Trinity (“Let Us make”) is thus enlisted as an authority, so to speak, in relation to the dignity of the human being: God’s consulting with his other Selves testifies to the originality of the human being, conceived as the latter is in the image of God’s communicative Selves communicating among Themselves in understanding and love particularly when creating the human being.

§2 This image in the human being is expressly located in the “inner man,” which is the soul. However, this soul is in the image of God by virtue of its being everywhere in the body, just as God is omnipresent in the creation. No one member is more in the image of the soul than any other: the entire body partakes of the image, as the soul enlivens the entire body. A barrier is thus put up against Platonist or Manichaeic tendencies to denigrate the body: the human being is body and soul in the image of God, because the soul, in which the image properly consists, is in its entirety throughout the body: “The soul is whole and complete in the smallest, and equally so in the biggest members.” In other words, whosoever touches the human body touches human dignity; there are no expendable parts of the body that remain untouched by the supreme and God-attested value of the soul or inner man.

§3 In the human soul the priority of the image expresses itself in three ways corresponding to the three Persons of God; firstly in its being, having life and having wisdom, just as God is, is life and is Wisdom. Secondly, the Trinity also divulges its image in the human being in the dignity of the intellect, in the dignity of the will and in the dignity of the memory. These are led back to Scripture’s “heart, soul, and mind,”⁵⁴ which are all one in the one person as the three Persons of the Trinity are one in the one God. Thirdly, the inner procession of the human triad is understood by analogy with the procession of the three Divine Persons: “Just as the Son is engendered by the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, so the will is engendered by the intellect and from both of these proceeds the memory.”⁵⁵

The second part of the paragraph lays the groundwork for discussing why the image and the likeness are not simply identical. In the image, in fact, there is

⁵⁴ Cf. Matt. 22.37.

⁵⁵ We note in passing that in so far as the “anyone” who is supposed “easily to understand this” excludes any member of the Eastern Orthodox Church, (the latter not accepting the procession of the Holy Spirit “from the Son also”) this remark may place the composition of the *Dicta* after the introduction of *filioque* in the West following the Synod of Frankfurt (794). See G. Podskalsky, “Filioque,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 4.449–450. It is more difficult to claim, however, that the passage testifies to awareness of the Eastern position, as the intellectual difficulty referred to could simply be the relative obscurity of the comparison between the Trinity and human psychology.

something that must be “lived up to,” a task. It is not enough to know God, he must be loved so as to dwell always in the memory. This requires human involvement, and thus gives rise to the “likeness which can be detected in right conduct,” treated of in §4.

§4 Here then are listed the virtues which draw us closer to God by likening us to him. And it is recalled that vice so diminishes the likeness as to make the human being like a beast.

§5 This very call to freedom is the greatest honor bestowed on the human being: to be decorated with Godlikeness in the virtues is to be clothed with splendor and beauty. To lose this likeness, however, is the greatest disgrace that could befall a human being: the virtuous life is thus the means by which Godlikeness is preserved and the image let shine forth in all its glory. Although the image is permanent the likeness can be lost—the dignity of the human creation consists in being created both *in* the image and *to* the likeness. The dignity of the human condition is thus in part a normative condition: the human being is created simultaneously as a fact and as a claim. In the concluding §6 of the *Dicta Albini* it is emphasized that the human being should remember his or her noble condition and live up to it by virtuous conduct. Freedom finalized by the good, i.e. teleological freedom, is thus part and parcel of human dignity according to the treatise.

THE *Dicta Candidi*

The *Dicta Candidi* opens with an affirmation of the microcosmic motif: the inner nature of the human being (the soul) is truly made in the image and likeness of God. In the composite version this statement serves as a transition from the *Dicta Albini* to the *Dicta Candidi*. Read without the interpolated scriptural references which render the message somewhat diffuse, the *Dicta Candidi* identifies soul as “that power” which is holding together and giving life to the “mass of mud moistened by sap”—metaphors for what we as bodily creatures are. Then it moves on to state that it is through the divine power that all creatures are what they are, thus implying that “soul” is a divine power. On the other hand the author is keen to affirm that the universe is “other than the One who made it without himself having been made.” There then follows a poetically speculative statement meant to illustrate this “firstness” or otherness: God is not what he has made, he is rather the One *out of whom*, the One *from whom* and the One *by whom* this universe is, and his Trinitarian mystery, in virtue of which he is two, and three, and one, is reflected in the soul as his image; the soul being two (in what it knows, and in knowledge); and three (in what it knows, in knowledge, and in the love of what it knows); and one in itself.

Let the soul, Candidus exhorts, compare itself to the creator who transcends it: it is comparable in all but one thing, which is that every perfection comes out of, from and through God. In this way the mind is like the Father because it gives rise to knowing, which in turn is like the Son; and both Father and Son give rise to the Holy Spirit, which is like love, and indeed is love—divine as well as human. Thus Candidus adds to the reflection of Alcuin on the way in which the soul or the inner man is the image

of God.⁵⁶ The soul may “compare itself to its Creator,” even though he surpasses it super-eminently; in this daring comparison is expressed the soul’s excellence. There is thus a strange sort of equivalence between the human being and God in the utterly axiomatic character which each of them has: *dignitas*. The super-eminence of the human being, by which it is the image of the super-eminence of God, is underlined in our treatise by the fact that its dignity or axiomaticity is triple, just as God is person not only as one but as three.

Now we must address the doctrine of human dignity in the treatise taken as a whole. Along with the image, dignity is present in all the parts of the body because the soul is present. The image does not in other words consist in the intellect—as Augustine claimed, not without some degree of exaggeration. The soul reflects God’s unity and his omnipresence, by being equally present in all parts of the body.

That one dignity qualifying the human being as super-eminent engenders another does not preclude the second dignity from being co-original, in the same sense as each of the Persons in the Trinity, although existing in an order of generation, is equal to the others in what a later, anonymous Scholastic master (perhaps influenced by this very treatise?) will call “*dignitas*”; meaning by that what defines the person as such: “*persona est hypostasis proprietate distincta ad dignitatem pertinente.*”⁵⁷

By virtue of the image the soul is commanded (*iubere*) to love God, its “Condition,” as it [the image] is known, and remember it as it is loved, so that the image also exerts a claim upon the possessor of it. The dignity which the image is in fact, exerts its claim on the one who possesses it as much as on everyone else. In this manner the image cannot be lost, although the likeness may be diminished, perhaps in some cases even lost, through undignified behavior.

The idea that the human being is important in itself since it reflects the absolute condition of the universe, and that its being claims this importance in the face of all—animals, humans, angels and God—is an idea which was always present, and which in our view is present in the depths of all cultures, but which has undergone historical development and takes different cultural forms. It is this idea which finds one of its earliest, and indeed one of its most systematic, expressions in the treatise(s) attributed to Alcuin and his pupil Candidus.

The use in the *Dicta Albini* of a terminology which in its author’s time was employed to designate high office (*dignitas*) makes it unlikely that it was composed at the court of Charlemagne, or indeed in any other court setting; a monastic ambiance is inherently more likely as the origin of the *Dicta Albini*. Its author did not feel obliged to emphasize, or even mention, “the exalted, God-given dignity of the prince” or any other such flattering terms, something which a courtier might well have felt obliged to do. The sort of language which genuflects before authority is conspicuously absent from our treatise. Perhaps this could point in the direction of a monastic setting where this type of dignity was nothing to be envious about: several monasteries, such as Ni-

⁵⁶ Cf. Rom 7.22.

⁵⁷ This “*diffinitio magistralis*” was quoted by Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Bonaventure, and Aquinas, among others, but the veil of anonymity has still not been lifted from its author. For the references to these leading Schoolmen, see Lebech, *Problem of Human Dignity* (n. 6 above) 75.

velles, for example, counted among its founders members of the royal line of Charlemagne.⁵⁸ Although the inhabitants of Nivelles would have enjoyed the protection of the Monarchy, their independence was assured by popular support and because they provided a highly prized check “away from the world” on the otherwise-feuding royal families.

7. The *Dicta Albini* in Sentences associated with the School of Laon

Dom Odon Lottin’s interest in early scholastic psychology led him to explore a corpus of “sentences” and publish a number of them.⁵⁹ He drew up a list of 250 of these anonymous but systematic essays, which he found scattered in numerous florilegia containing authentic “sentences” of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux. Some of the items were extracted from biblical commentaries. The one that interests us was found in the Douai MS Bibl. Municipale 371, fols. 32r–33v. It carries no name and gives no indication regarding the provenance of its material. Lottin himself was not aware of its origin, the latter was pointed out by Gérard Mathon.⁶⁰ The text of DDCH appears together with the interpolation, but it lacks the final section on the likeness of the human being to the Creator. From a textual point of view this copy is worthless, having many omissions of words and even of sentences, numerous word inversions, and mistaken readings. Its only interest lies in its witness to the diffusion of DDCH in a learned milieu of northern France in the early twelfth century.⁶¹

Bishop Ivo of Chartres, who died in 1115/6, was associated ca. 1060 with the school of Bec under Lanfranc, and in some way also with the school of Anselm of Laon, who died only a year after him, in 1117.⁶² Ivo pursued the scholastic activity which typified Laon, namely the composition of theological *sententiae*, and added to that the *Decretum*, his collection of canon law texts, and letters. His mind possessed a practical and pastoral orientation. His work is further characterized by the wide use he made of theological sources, among which one finds (in Part XVII of the *Decretum*) the *Dicta Albini*, placed at the head of a series of sentences drawn from the Church Fathers concerning the theological virtues.⁶³ The text is given unabridged.⁶⁴ Ivo chose

⁵⁸ See G. Despy, “Nivelles,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 6.1203.

⁵⁹ Odon Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles, t. 5: Problèmes d’histoire littéraire. L’école d’Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux* (Gembloux 1959) 248–250, no. 313.

⁶⁰ Gérard Mathon, *L’Anthropologie chrétienne en occident de Saint Augustin à Jean Scot Erigène* (Lille 1964) 221.

⁶¹ One of the “sentences” conveys a thought about the dignity of the angelic nature and its place in the fall of the rebel angels, as well as in the confirmation of the faithful ones: “Deus angelos in magna dignitate constituit; quorum quidam nondum experti fragilitatem sed a seipsis tantam credentes se habere dignitatem uersi in superbiam expulsi sunt a Deo. In quo casu aliqui non consenserunt, naturam suam quantum ad se debilem recognoscentes, ita infirmati sunt ut sibi non attribuerunt, sed soli Deo suam dignitatem qui nunquam ita confirmati fuissent nisi illi cecidissent; nam et ipsi de dignitate sua superbierent.” Lottin, *Psychologie et morale* (n. 59 above) n. 307.

⁶² A. Becker, “Ivo von Chartres,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 5.839–840; R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe: Volume 1; Foundations* (Oxford 1995) 252–261.

⁶³ D. Ivonis Carnotensis Episcopi, *Decreti Pars Decima Septima*, PL 161.967–969. Chap. 1 consists of the *De imagine* or *Dicta Albini*, quoted under the title, “Quanta sit dignitas conditionis humanae, et ne quis ab ea servili conditione degeneret.”

⁶⁴ It contains those faulty readings which are characteristic of 12th-c. witnesses, as was seen in our discussion of “The composite version.”

to place the *Dicta* at the threshold of his treatment of faith, hope, and charity. He attributed great authority to it, evidently considering it to be part of the patristic heritage on which he was to draw throughout his Part XVII. His use of the *Dicta Albini* afforded the writing a further channel of diffusion.

8. *Dicta Albini* and *Dicta Candidi* in the compilation *De spiritu et anima*

The compilation on psychological themes known as *De spiritu et anima* (or *De differentia spiritus et animae*) was printed by Migne among the pseudo-Augustinian works, since it frequently passed under the name of the saint in manuscripts of the Middle Ages.⁶⁵ No attribution of the treatise has been convincingly supported. Before 1230 Philip the Chancellor had already rejected the attribution of the work to Augustine, and in this view he was followed by Albert the Great. Early on in his career Thomas Aquinas considered it to be the work “of some Cistercian who compiled it from the writings of Augustine and added bits by himself.”⁶⁶ The Maurist editors associated it with Alcher of Clairvaux, O.Cist., but this attribution has not been upheld by the more recent scholarship, nor has any other name (such as that of Peter Comestor) found solid support.⁶⁷

More important than the question of authorial identity is the examination of the numerous writings which were drawn upon or excerpted in order to make the compilation. In 1924 Leo Norpoth conducted a detailed examination of the sources, naming a large number of greater and lesser figures from Isidore of Seville down to Ps.-Bernard and Richard of St. Victor.⁶⁸ Norpoth had the merit of spotting the presence in chapters 34 and 35 of the *De spiritu et anima* of what he called “Ps.-Ambrosius’s *De dignitate conditionis humanae*.” When one looks into it more closely, chapter 34 is found to contain only two short extracts, each of several lines, from the *Dicta Candidi*, concerning the soul in its difference from the mind.⁶⁹ But it is a different story when the reader passes to chapter 35, which is devoted to human dignity.⁷⁰ The expanded title used in *De spiritu* could serve to some extent as an epitome of the treatise DDCH which, as we have seen, resulted from the fusion of the *Dicta Albini* and the *Dicta Candidi*: “The Dignity of the Human Condition; Man as Made to the Image of God; Again, how the Image of God [is] in the Soul; How far the Soul may bear the Likeness of God.”⁷¹ In chapter 35 of *De spiritu et anima* the *Dicta Albini* is present in

⁶⁵ PL 40.779–832.

⁶⁶ Thomas Aquinas, *In IV Sententiarum*, D.44, q.4, a.3, sol.2, ad.12.

⁶⁷ See the *Monitum* in PL 40.779–780. The most comprehensive account of the authorship question is supplied by Bernard McGinn, *Three Treatises on Man: A Cistercian Anthropology*, Cistercian Fathers 24 (Kalamazoo 1977). Cf. Diethard Aschoff, “Der pseudo-augustinische Traktat ‘De spiritu et anima,’” *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 18 (1972) 293–294; Augustin Hiedl, “Die pseudo-augustinische Schrift ‘De spiritu et anima’ in den Frühwerken Alberts des Grossen,” *Studia Anselmiana* 63 (1974) 97–121.

⁶⁸ Leo Norpoth, *Der pseudo-augustinische Traktat “De Spiritu et Anima.”* Philosophische Dissertation (München, 1924). Erstmals gedruckt und anstelle einer Festschrift dem Autor zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 14. April 1971 überreicht (Köln 1971).

⁶⁹ The two extracts are identified in the apparatus to our translation (cf. Part 2) of the *Dicta Candidi*.

⁷⁰ Bibliographical references relative to *De spiritu et anima* are to be found in Machielsen, ed., *Clavis Patristica* 2A (n. 15 above) no. 153.

⁷¹ PL 40.805: “Dignitas humanae conditionis. Homo quatenus ad imaginem Dei. Rursus quomodo imago Dei in anima. Quatenus anima gerat similitudinem Dei.”

its entirety. A substantial paragraph regarding the soul/body//God/world analogy is interpolated. On the other hand the *Dicta Candidi* is not included in chapter 35 save for its words of introduction: “Et ideo mihi iuste videtur dictum, nostrum interiorem hominem esse imaginem Dei.” The inclusion of these words is enough to show that the compiler of *De spiritu et anima* had access to the composite text but was also in a position to recognize the status of the *Dicta Albini* as an independent unit within it.

The inclusion of the latter in the compilation can be regarded as the single most vital incident in the entire history of the diffusion of Ps.-Alcuin’s *Dicta* up to the invention of printing. The exceptionally wide diffusion of the *De spiritu et anima* carried the message of the dignity of the human “condition” far and wide and was beyond any comparison the most influential literary instrument of the dissemination of the idea in treatise form throughout medieval Europe. Can any estimate, even the roughest, be made of the numbers of copies of *De spiritu et anima* that were in circulation by the fifteenth century? The catalogues of the English monastic libraries which are being edited for the British Academy and the series of which is not yet complete, have been searched for copies of the *De spiritu et anima*, and thus far 94 identifications have been made.⁷² This number gives only a rough estimate of the copies attested to in surviving library records, but it is sufficient to indicate the quite unusual popularity achieved by the compilation. For Western Europe as a whole the total could well amount to many hundreds, far surpassing the number of independently-circulating witnesses to the text of the *Dicta Albini*.⁷³ The titles assigned to chapter 35 of *De spiritu* in English collections show considerable variation, for example: *de dignitate condicionis humane*; *qualiter factus est homo ad similitudinem Dei*; *qualiter factus est homo ad ymaginem sui conditoris*; *de ymagine Dei in homine*; *Augustinus qualiter homo factus est ad ymaginem et similitudinem Dei*; *sermo de ymagine*; *sermo de hominis dignitate*; *de creatione primi hominis*.

We give the outcome of our collation of the treatise *De spiritu et anima* with the combined version in order to show the relationship of the former to the textual tradition of the latter, printed as DDCH in PL 17. The results of the comparison can be condensed as follows: just like DDCH,⁷⁴ *De spiritu et anima* has the addition “sapiente” (n. 93) and the verbs “intelligitur” and “diligitur” in the indicative and not the subjunctive mood (nn. 98, 99); at the textual divergence (n. 105) *proprius*/*propius* (PL 17), *De spiritu et anima* has “*proprius*,” which is clearly a deliberate correction;⁷⁵ the divergence (n.103) in *moribus*/*in minoribus* (PL 17) occurs in one of the small number of phrases omitted by *De spiritu et anima*;⁷⁶ finally, regarding the phrase “*hac similitudine gloria*” (n.108) *De spiritu et anima* sides with the text given in PL 17 to adopt the *lectio facilior*, “*hac similitudinis gloria*.” We can conclude from this

⁷² Richard Sharpe, “List of Identifications” [www.history.ox.ac.uk/sharpe/index.htm] 2008.

⁷³ Marenbon lists the witnesses to both *Dicta* in tabular form; *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 149–150. With reference to the *Dicta Albini* he lists 3 MSS of the 13th c., 4 of the 14th, and 13 of the 15th. All but one of the latter carries an attribution of the piece to Augustine.

⁷⁴ See our discussion of “The composite version” above.

⁷⁵ The *Decretum* of Ivo of Chartres at this point has *propinquior*, an attempt to make sense of the meaning of *prope*/*propius* (“close”).

⁷⁶ The *Decretum* of Ivo has the correct “*in moribus*.”

evidence that the compiler of *De spiritu et anima* had access to a text closely in sympathy with that which appears in PL 17.

The interpolation within *De spiritu et anima* chapter 35 runs as follows, in our translation:

[The soul] is infused into the body in such a way as not to be parceled out in the parts of the members. For it suffers as a whole at any place where a part of the body is struck. In a wondrous way it presides in the members by one and the same vivification; though it is not diverse by nature, still through the body it performs diverse acts. It is indeed [the soul] that sees through the eyes, hears through the ears, smells through the nostrils, tastes through the mouth, touches through all the members, and by touching tells the difference between soft and hard. Even though it is not diverse still it has diverse sense-operations. It is from this that it is understood that the soul, according to its own modality, is in the body as God is in the world. It is of course within and without, higher and lower; in ruling superior, in bearing inferior; in filling interior, in surrounding exterior. It is within in such a way as to be without; it carries that it may preside. And just as God does not either increase when creatures are increased nor decrease when they decrease, so the soul is neither lessened in the small members nor increased in the greater.⁷⁷

The treatise *De spiritu et anima* has sometimes been attributed, although on insufficient evidence, to the Parisian theologian Petrus Comestor (d. 1187) who was the successor of Peter Lombard at the School of Notre-Dame and chancellor of the cathedral.⁷⁸ His learnedly condensed account of salvation history up to the Ascension of Christ, the *Historia scholastica* (composed 1169–1173) includes a paragraph which deserves to be quoted, not only because it witnesses the occurrence of the words *hominis dignitas* but also because it makes reference to several important motifs drawn from the tradition we have sketched:

God granted to the human being to excel the other living creatures. And so the dignity of the human being is marked in three ways. Firstly because not only was he made in his kind like the creatures mentioned, but he is also the image of God. Secondly, because [the human being] was made with deliberation. Whereas in the case of the other works, he spoke and they were made, in this case on the other hand the [divine] Persons said, “Let us make,” as though deliberating among themselves. Thirdly, because he was established as the lord over the animals, that the latter might be there for him, who God knew would be mortal, for food and clothing, and for help in his work. For before sin God gave only grasses and fruits of the trees as food to humans and animals; this is what one gathers from the fact that before sin the earth produced nothing poisonous or sterile.⁷⁹

The welcome extended to the idea of human dignity in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and which can be attested in the ways we have just detailed, lends a measure of support to the general claim advanced by the late Sir Richard Southern in his exploration of Scholastic Humanism: “The first fundamental characteristic of the products of the schools is a strong sense of the dignity of human nature. Without this

⁷⁷ PL 40.805.

⁷⁸ Riccardo Quinto “Petrus Comestor,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 6, 1967–1968.

⁷⁹ Petrus Comestor, *Historia scholastica: liber Genesis*, ed. A. Sylwan, CCCM 191 (Turnhout 2005) 21–22.

there can be no humanism of any description, and it is a conspicuous force in the schools of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.”⁸⁰

9. Robert Grosseteste, human dignity and the image of God

The reliance placed by Robert Grosseteste upon the *De spiritu et anima* has been brought out in some detail through the examination of his psychological ideas and the analysis of the relevant sources.⁸¹ Very likely it was the same compilation which served as his immediate source for the entire text of the *Dicta Albini*.⁸² Grosseteste was evidently not aware of the identity of the author of the material he read in chapter 35 of *De spiritu et anima* under the heading “Dignitas humanae conditionis.” Two of his writings carry direct quotations from the *Dicta Albini*, but both quotations are attributed to Augustine. In the first item of his letter-collection Grosseteste quotes the passage on the analogy between the divine ubiquity and the omnipresence of the soul in the body, attributing it unhesitatingly to Augustine.⁸³ In his theological masterpiece, the *Hexaëmeron*, he quotes the same passage,⁸⁴ again attributing its origin to Augustine. When he comes to Genesis 1.26 he quotes the opening lines of the *Dicta Albini* concerning the counsel taken by the Trinity of divine Persons whilst contemplating the creation of the human being, and the “privilege of dignity” conferred by the creation in such a way that humans would recognize how much they owed to the Creator, “ut dicit Augustinus.”⁸⁵

Two doubts could be entertained concerning the *De spiritu et anima* as the source of these quotations. The first concerns a reading (*amaret*) which Grosseteste’s second quotation shares with the *Dicta Albini* against the variant (*diligeret*) in *De spiritu et anima*. This textual feature would be troubling were it not for the fact that *De spiritu et anima* exhibits numerous variants, word inversions and textual short cuts, when compared with Marenbon’s edition of the writing by Ps.-Alcuin. The second possible doubt concerns Grosseteste’s repeated use of the phrase “de dignitate condicionis humane,” by contrast with the title given in the Migne edition of *De spiritu et anima*, chapter 35: “Dignitas humanae conditionis.” Neither of these hesitations is of sufficient weight to persuade us that Grosseteste had access to the *Dicta Albini* in its pure form, or even to the composite version.⁸⁶ He did not make mention of either of

⁸⁰ Southern, *Scholastic Humanism* (n. 62 above) 22; “The dignity of human nature” is discussed on 22–25.

⁸¹ James McEvoy, *The Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford 1982). See Index of Ancient and Medieval Authors under “Ps.-Augustine, *De spiritu et anima*.”

⁸² We are here summarizing the results of our study, “Grosseteste’s Understanding of Human Dignity,” which is to appear in James Ginther and Joe Goering, eds., *Robert Grosseteste and His Intellectual Milieu* (Toronto 2010).

⁸³ *Roberti Grosseteste Epistolae*, ed. H. R. Luard (London 1861) 10.

⁸⁴ *Robert Grosseteste, Hexaëmeron*, ed. R. C. Dales and Servus Gieben, *Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi* 6 (London 1982) 228–229 (8.7.1). This passage is located in *De spiritu et anima* (PL 40.805 at lines 25–32); cf. *Dicta Albini*, in Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 159.

⁸⁵ Grosseteste, *Hexaëmeron* 232 (8.11.1).

⁸⁶ One of the English manuscripts of *De imagine* was in the possession of the Franciscans at Lincoln (now Cambridge, MS St. John’s College 47). The manuscript is dated to the close of the 13th c. or the beginning of the 14th. It may have been copied from an exemplar to which Grosseteste might have had access.

these in his *Tabula* (i.e., his notebook concordance of the Bible and the Fathers⁸⁷), despite the fact that he entered a large number of biblical and patristic references under the heading “de dignitate condicionis humane.” In the *Tabula* he cast his net widely over such classics as Seneca, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great and John of Damascus, but made no mention of any treatise bearing as its title the heading he himself gave to the entries in his *Tabula*, namely “de dignitate condicionis humane”). Furthermore the *Dicta Candidi* is not referred to or quoted by Grosseteste, so far as we have been able to ascertain. It will be recalled that it figured briefly and anonymously in chapter 34 of *De spiritu et anima*. At any rate the compiler of the latter had not set out to copy or imitate the composite version of the two *Dicta*.

It still remains the case, however, even when we take account of these limitations and hesitations, that through the intermediary of *De spiritu et anima* Grosseteste made employment of two of the most significant ideas put forward by Ps.-Alcuin with regard to human dignity, and that he also used the expression “dignitas conditionis humanae” to designate this complex of ideas. The use to which he put these ideas is signaled by direct quotations. Thus a very significant, even though anonymous, influence of the Ps.-Alcuin is actively and prominently present in the thinker who probed more deeply and more insistently into the theory of human dignity that did any other in the course of the later Middle Ages. Robert Grosseteste’s conception of human dignity was based on a much wider investigation than anything that Ps.-Alcuin could have undertaken. Grosseteste canvassed several Greek sources as well as the traditional Latin ones, as he labored to assemble the collection of references which it was his design to record in his *Tabula*. It can be safely stated that Grosseteste brought together there the most varied set of Christian references to human dignity of his age. The results of his wide literary trawl have still not been fully exploited, in particular as regards his Augustinian references. He devoted more consistent thought to human dignity than did any other figure of the medieval schools.

It is sometimes argued that the idea of human dignity is a modern creation, and sometimes that the ancients, and in particular the Stoic philosophers, were its forerunners, but that the idea suffered an eclipse during the Middle Ages.⁸⁸ That this was not the case is shown by our exploration of the Christian conception of the dignity of the human creation/human dignity and the various authors and writings through which it was in fact quite widely received in the course of the Middle Ages. It should not be forgotten that the liturgical prayer *super oblata*, with its reference to “the dignity of the human substance” created by God, reinforced the language of *dignitas humana*

⁸⁷ *Tabula*, ed. Philipp W. Rosemann, Opera Roberti Grosseteste Lincolnensis 1, CCCM (Turnhout 1995) 235–320. For the entry concerning human dignity see 278. For a full discussion of the manuscript, contents, and sources of the work see Philipp W. Rosemann, “Robert Grosseteste’s *Tabula*,” in J. McEvoy, ed., *Robert Grosseteste: New Perspectives on his Thought and Scholarship*. Instrumenta Patristica 27 (Turnhout 1995) 321–355.

⁸⁸ See for example D. Kretzmer and E. Klein, eds., *The Concept of Human Dignity in Human Rights Discourse* (The Hague 2002).

with each one who understood Latin, either as celebrant of the liturgy or as a participant.⁸⁹

PART II: THE TWO DICTA TRANSLATED

We have based our translation upon the edition by John Marenbon. The editor relied principally upon three manuscripts: Munich, MS Staatsbibliothek clm 6407; Rome, MS Biblioteca Padri Maristi A.II.1; Vatican City, MS Vaticanus lat. 7207. He took account of five further witnesses out of the total of twenty known to him. The paragraph divisions of the Latin edition have been replicated, and have been numbered. The translation aims at fidelity to the thought without being over-literal; it is destined principally to serve the purposes of philosophical understanding and analysis.

DICTA ALBINI DE IMAGINE DEI. THE WRITING OF ALBINUS ON THE IMAGE OF GOD.

§1. “Let us make man to our image and likeness.”⁹⁰ It is recognized that the dignity of the human condition⁹¹ is so great that the human being came into existence not simply by the Word commanding, as was the case for the rest of the six-days work, but by the Holy Trinity’s taking counsel and by the work of the divine majesty.⁹² This was done thus so that from the honor attaching to his first making the human being might comprehend just how much he owed to his Maker, since it was at his creation that the Maker at once granted him the privilege of dignity, so that the more he would understand how astonishingly he was made by him the more ardently he would love his Maker. This understanding was to derive not only from the counsel of the Holy Trinity,⁹³ which meant that the human being was thus surpassingly⁹⁴ created by his Maker, but also from the realization that the Creator of all created [this creature] to his own image and likeness, something which was granted to no other thing made.

§2. This image⁹⁵ should be more attentively pondered on the basis of the nobility of the inner man.⁹⁶ In the first place, then, ponder that just as the one God is whole and entire in every place, giving life and movement to all and guiding them (as the Apostle confirms: “For in him we live, and move, and are”⁹⁷), in a similar way the soul is alive, all of it being at every place in the body giving life, movement and direction. Thus there is not more soul present in the bigger members of its body and less in the smaller ones; rather the soul is whole and complete in the smallest and equally so in

⁸⁹ A theological, or rather a Christological, interpretation of human dignity is to be found, e.g., in Thomas à Kempis: “O quanta dignitas humanae condicionis, ut natura humana Deo unita in persona transcendat super omnem creaturam in caelo et in terra.” *De resurrectione orationes in duas partes sectae*, *Thomae Hemerken a Kempis Opera Omnia*, ed. M. J. Pohl, vol. 5 (Fribourg 1902) pars 2, cap. 1, p. 336, line 13.

⁹⁰ PL 17, Caput primum. The quotation is from Gen. 1.26.

⁹¹ Or, “the way the human being was made.”

⁹² Cf. Ambrose, *Exameron*, ed. C. Schenkl, CSEL 32 (Vienna 1897) 231–233 (6.7.40–41); Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram*, ed. J. Zycha, CSEL 28.1 (Vienna 1894) 85–86 (3.19); Bede, *In Genesim*, ed. Charles W. Jones, CC 118A (Turnhout 1967) 25 (1).

⁹³ Indicated by the use of the plural “We, Our.”

⁹⁴ We have used “surpassingly” to translate “excellenter.”

⁹⁵ PL 17, Caput secundum.

⁹⁶ Cf. Rom. 7.22; Eph. 3.16.

⁹⁷ Acts 17.28.

the biggest members.⁹⁸ And this⁹⁹ is the image which the soul has in itself of the unity of the all-powerful God.

§3. The soul, moreover, has a kind of image of the Holy Trinity, consisting in the first place in the fact that just as God is, and has life and wisdom, so the soul in its own limited way is, and has life and is wise. There is in addition another trinity in the soul, a trinity that¹⁰⁰ was made to the likeness of its Maker, namely the perfect and highest Trinity which is in¹⁰¹ Father and Son and Holy Spirit. Though that trinity is of one nature it nevertheless has in it three dignities,¹⁰² i.e., intellect, will, and memory. This is the very same thing as is designated in the Gospel, albeit in different words, when it is said, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind”;¹⁰³ that is to say with the entire intellect and the entire will and the entire memory. Just as the Son is engendered by the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, so the will is engendered by the intellect and from both of these proceeds the memory, as anyone¹⁰⁴ can easily understand. Now the soul cannot be¹⁰⁵ perfect without these three capacities, nor can any one of these three be complete as regards its happiness¹⁰⁶ without the other two. And just as God the Father is, God the Son is, and God the Holy Spirit is, while on the other hand there are not three gods but One God having three persons, so the soul is intellect, the soul is will and the soul is memory, while on the other hand there are not three souls in one body but one soul possessing three dignities.¹⁰⁷ Now in these three our inward nature¹⁰⁸ astonishingly bears within it the image of him, and out of them, as from the more surpassing dignities of the soul, we are commanded to love the Maker, so that as much as he may be¹⁰⁹ known he may be loved, and as much as he may be¹¹⁰ loved he may be kept always in the memory. But then, mere understanding of him is not enough unless the will comes to love him; still more, these two are not sufficient unless we add the memory in virtue of which God may dwell always in the mind of the one who understands and loves him. Just as there cannot be any¹¹¹ single moment in which the human being is not deriving profit from God's goodness and mercy or being in enjoyment of it, in the same way there ought to be no moment in which the memory does not keep him present.¹¹² Hold these things regarding the image.

⁹⁸ At this point *De spiritu et anima* interpolates extraneous material.

⁹⁹ I.e., omnipresence in the body.

¹⁰⁰ quae/PL 17: qua.

¹⁰¹ quae est in/PL 17: quae ex.

¹⁰² dignitates/*De spiritu et anima*: vires.

¹⁰³ Matt. 22.37.

¹⁰⁴ a quolibet/PL 17 and *De spiritu et anima*: a sapiente quolibet.

¹⁰⁵ nec enim anima perfecta potest esse/PL 17: nec enim anima perfecta esse.

¹⁰⁶ beatitudo/*De spiritu et anima*: habitudo.

¹⁰⁷ dignitates/ *De spiritu et anima*: vires.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Rom. 7.22; Eph. 3.16.

¹⁰⁹ intelligatur/PL 17 and *De spiritu et anima*: intelligitur.

¹¹⁰ diligatur/PL 17 and *De spiritu et anima*: diligitur.

¹¹¹ nullum potest esse momentum/ PL 17: non potest esse momentum.

¹¹² At this point the *Dicta Candidi* is inserted in the composite version.

§4. But¹¹³ now understand some things about the likeness which can be detected in right conduct.¹¹⁴ Just as God, the Creator who created the human being to his likeness, is charity, is good and just, is patient and mild, pure and merciful, and the other distinctive marks of holy virtues which can be read of,¹¹⁵ so the human being was created in such a way as to have charity, to be good and just, to be patient and mild, pure and merciful. The more someone has these virtues in himself the more he is special¹¹⁶ to God, and the greater is the likeness he bears to the Creator. If on the other hand (which would be a terrible thing!) someone goes astray through the byways of the vices and the forking ways of evil deeds and wanders mistakenly and ignobly away from the likeness of his Maker, in that case it will be with him as it is written: “And man when he was in honor did not understand; he is compared to senseless beasts, and is become like to them.”¹¹⁷

§5. What greater honor could have come to the human being than that he should have been made to the likeness of his Maker, and should have been decorated with the same clothing of the virtues as is his Maker, of whom we read: “The Lord hath reigned, he is clothed with beauty”;¹¹⁸ that is, he is decorated with the splendor of all the virtues and with the beauty of all goodness? Or what greater disgrace could there be for a human being, or what more unhappy misery than that, the glory of likeness¹¹⁹ to his Creator having been lost, he should fall to the unlovely and irrational likeness of the brute beasts of burden?

§6. Wherefore¹²⁰ let each one pay attention to the transcendence of his original making. Let him acknowledge as something to be revered in himself the image of the Holy Trinity. Let him struggle by nobility of conduct, by the exercise of the virtues, by the dignity of his merits, to possess the honor of the divine likeness to which he was created; so that when it may appear who he is, he may appear like to him¹²¹ who in the first Adam¹²² made him marvelously to his likeness, and in the Second¹²³ even more marvelously reshaped him.”

DICTA CANDIDI PRESBYTERI DE IMAGINE DEI. THE WRITING OF CANDIDUS THE PRIEST ON THE IMAGE OF GOD.

The words and phrases emphasized translate material that is present in the composite version [DDCH] while not being found in Marenbon’s critical edition of the *Dicta Candidi*. Such material includes variants found in the composite version, scriptural references added in by the compiler, and short glosses, as found in the text of DDCH published under the name of St. Ambrose at PL 17.1107–1108.

¹¹³ PL 17, Caput tertium.

¹¹⁴ in moribus/PL 17: in minoribus. *De spiritu et anima* omits “which can be ...conduct.”

¹¹⁵ i.e. in the Holy Scriptures.

¹¹⁶ proprius/PL 17: propius.

¹¹⁷ Ps. 48.13.

¹¹⁸ Ps. 29.1.

¹¹⁹ hac similitudine gloria sui conditoris/PL 17: hac similitudinis gloria sui conditoris

¹²⁰ PL 17: adds “O dilectissime.”

¹²¹ 1 John 3.2.

¹²² *De spiritu et anima*: in primo homine.

¹²³ *De spiritu et anima* adds: i.e. in se ipso [cf. Rom. 5.12–21; 1 Cor. 15.21–22, 45–49].

§1. And thus, most dear son, the statement seems to me to be true, that our inward nature¹²⁴ is the image of God. For by “soul” is signified the entire inner human being; by it¹²⁵ that mass of mud moistened by sap is given life, is ruled and held together, lest it become withered and be dissolved.¹²⁶ God is referred to as that power, ineffably great and innumerably wise, as it is written: “Great is our Lord and great is his power; and of his wisdom there is no number,”¹²⁷ and incomparably sweet as it is said elsewhere, “The Lord is sweet to all and his tender mercies are over all his works.”¹²⁸ From that and through it and by it are all the things that are; all that exist are governed, all that exist are contained. By “all things” I mean the universe itself, which is the whole. This is other than the One who made it without himself having been made, he is rather that One “out of whom” and the One “from him” and the One “by whom.”¹²⁹ God himself, as the One “from whom,” is called the Father by us, in our poverty of wit and our even greater poverty of words; as the one who is “from him” he is called the Son; as the One “by whom,” the Holy Spirit. The reason indeed why God is called “the Father” is that he is the One “out of whom” both Wisdom, by which all things are ordered¹³⁰ and love, by which all things want themselves to remain just as they are, were ordained. The one “out of whom,” and the one “out of him,” and the one “by whom,” love each other. These two are three and those three are one, for this reason, that the two come from One in such a way that they are nevertheless not separated from him, but are still “from him” because they are not from themselves, and they are “in him” because they are not separated off. And those two are the same as the One, and the One is the same as those two, yet those two are not the same as the One, and those two are not the self-same One which they are. God is that power, and God himself is three and each one of these three is God, and all those three are not gods but God.

§2. The Creator, as we said above, made to his own image the human soul, the entirety of which is called soul. However, when I say “mind” I do not designate anything else of the human being but the soul, but for one reason it is called “soul” and for another “mind.” For all that lives of the human being is the soul, but when the soul within herself acts on herself and from herself and through herself, “mind” is the term that is usually employed; on the other hand the sense, when carrying out its own functions, is more usually referred to as “soul.”¹³¹ The mind therefore engenders knowledge, and loves to know that it knows. What I am speaking of is not that knowing through which a particular thing is suddenly known which was thought beforehand to be unknown, but rather that knowing from which both the particular thing and also everything whatever that is known or not known, is capable of being

¹²⁴ Rom. 7.22.

¹²⁵ i.e., the soul.

¹²⁶ “For by ... be dissolved.” This sentence is misplaced in *De spiritu et anima* where it occurs in chap. 34.

¹²⁷ Ps. 146.5.

¹²⁸ Ps. 144.9.

¹²⁹ cf. Rom. 11.35; Heb. 2.10.

¹³⁰ Ps. 103.24.

known. That is the knowing which the mind engenders. When it is engendered it can be called science. Hence we have here two realities: the mind and what the mind knows; there remains a third, which is in common to both. Whatever it knows, every mind loves to know. Love presupposes no less than two, that is, the lover and the object of love. And so the love of both is one single love—which is a third reality. Indeed, it cannot be denied that this whole is one soul, and that the one soul is these three realities; for just as these three really are one soul, so not less truly is the one soul each single one of the three realities.

§3. Therefore let this very eminent creature compare itself to its Creator who surpasses it supereminently; except for this, that all goodness and every good thing, and the sweetness of all goodness and of every good thing, the Creator is because of himself; the creature in contrast derives from another, not from itself, both “that it is” and “what it is”; what he is, he is forever. Granted, the soul also is somehow immutable; for it is forever, once it has begun to be and knows and desires to know.

Let the soul, as I have said, compare herself as best she can to her Creator; so that the mind may be called “Father,” since it engenders knowing; and knowing may be called “Son,” because it is derived from another and is not a different thing than what the one it comes from is; and love may be called “Holy Spirit,” since it is the love of both those who love each other. Let this creature therefore that is so eminent compare itself to its Creator who transcends it, while making this exception—and much that is based upon it: that all goodness and every good, and the sweetness of every goodness and good, belong to the Creator from himself, whereas not only that it exists but also that it is such, comes to the creature from the other, not from itself. And he is always what he is; though even the soul itself is unchangeable in some way of its own. Once the soul has come into existence it always is and knows and desires to know. As I said, let the soul therefore compare itself to the Creator in the way it can. Let the mind be called “Father,” since it gives rise to knowing; knowing be called “Son,” because it is from another and is not other than that One out of which he is; let the Holy Spirit be called “love,” since he is of both of them who love each other. That is why in our Scriptures the Spirit himself is rather frequently called “love,” that is, charity, which is in God with regard to us, and which is from us in regard to God.

[Dearest son, hold these things concerning the image.¹³²]

¹³¹ “However when I say ‘mind’... referred to as ‘soul’”: this sentence is also found in *De spiritu et anima*, chap. 34.

¹³² This address is displaced from the close of *Dicta Albini* §3; the words “O dilectissime fili” are an addition.

APPENDIX by John Flood: The Middle English Translation of *De imagine Dei*

It is as a treatise attributed to St. Augustine that the work known as *Dicta Albini de imagine Dei* appears, untitled, in Middle English in four manuscripts from the fifteenth century:

MS A: Oxford, All Souls MS 24;

MS B: British Library MS Harley 2330;

MS C: Cambridge University Library MS Ii.vi.39;

MS D: Cambridge University Library MS Ii.vi.55.¹³³

Because of the length of some of these MSS a full description of each of them is not recorded here.¹³⁴ However, a brief summary of each MSS is useful.

MS A: Oxford, All Souls MS 24.¹³⁵ Date: s. xv med.¹³⁶ Principal contents: five texts in English attributed to St. Augustine.¹³⁷

MS B: British Library MS Harley 2330.¹³⁸ Date: 2nd quarter of s. xv. Principal contents: four texts in English attributed to St. Augustine.

MS C: Cambridge University Library MS Ii.vi.39.¹³⁹ Date: s. xv. 2 vols. Principal contents: ten texts in Latin (mainly theological, but with mathematical and medical material), six texts in English (five theological texts and a translation of Petrarch). In addition the MS has a number of hymns recorded in spare pages.

MS D: Cambridge University Library MS Ii.vi.55.¹⁴⁰ Date: first decade of s. xv. Principal contents: eleven religious texts in English.

The four texts of *De imagine Dei* are very similar and closely follow the Latin.¹⁴¹ They are clearly variants of the same translation rather than two or more independent translations. Because of the number of Latin MSS we cannot be sure of the precise text from which the translator worked.¹⁴²

¹³³ I am grateful to Norma Aubertin-Potter of All Souls' College Library and Jayne Ringrose of Cambridge University Library for their assistance with these manuscripts.

¹³⁴ Only MS A has been described recently; the older catalogue entries for the other manuscripts contain a number of errors.

¹³⁵ See Andrew G. Watson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of All Souls' College Oxford* (Oxford 1997) 49–50.

¹³⁶ Malcolm Parkes has dated the four manuscripts on the basis of their palaeography. It is these dates that are used here. I am grateful to Prof. Parkes for his assistance and note that he has no responsibility for any of my errors.

¹³⁷ For my purpose here it is not necessary to record texts written on flyleaves, jottings on what used to be the blank paper between texts etc.

¹³⁸ *A Catalogue of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts, in the British Museum*, rev. ed., 4 vols. (London 1808–1812) 2.655.

¹³⁹ *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, 6 vols. (Cambridge 1858) 3.535–538. M. R. James, “Notes by M. R. James,” “Manuscript Descriptions” in Manuscripts Reading Room, Cambridge University Library. A. I. Doyle, “A survey of the origins and circulation of theological writings in English in the 14th, 15th, and early 16th centuries with special consideration of the part of the clergy therein,” 2 vols. (Ph.D., University of Cambridge 1953) 2.84–85.

¹⁴⁰ *Catalogue...University of Cambridge*, 3.545–547. James, “Notes by M. R. James.” Doyle, “A survey,” 2.84.

¹⁴¹ The only possible influence of *De spiritu et anima* comes in l. 27 where “ech wyse man” translates “a sapiente quolibet.”

¹⁴² Marenbon lists 30 extant manuscripts dating from the 15th c. or earlier. Marenbon, *From the Circle* (n. 13 above) 149–150. The Latin text used here is from *ibid.* 158–161.

The manuscripts can be divided into two groups, ABD and C. ABD are composed of English theological or devotional material and have much of their contents in common. Thus, for example, A has only one text that is not in B and D. Similarly, all of B is to be found in A and D. D has unique material by virtue of the fact that it is the longest manuscript of the group ABD. The texts that ABD have in common are all attributed to Augustine. C stands a little apart from ABD. It shares two pseudo-Augustinian texts with ABD and an anonymous English treatise on maidenhood with D. However, C differs from ABD in containing works in Latin and non-theological works.

ORIGIN OF THE TRANSLATION

There is evidence that the translation is of Lollard origin.¹⁴³ The Harleian catalogue considers MS B to be of Lollard provenance.¹⁴⁴ This ascription has been repeated in recent times.¹⁴⁵ Archbishop Arundel's *Constitutions* of 1409 (which were aimed at preventing the dissemination of the thought of Wyclif and vernacular versions of the Bible) were interpreted as forbidding even the translation of individual biblical verses into English. *De imagine* has several translated scriptural passages which draw on the "Later Version" of the Lollard Bible (a work which replaced the "Early Version" which was considered a slavishly literal translation of the Vulgate).¹⁴⁶ These passages are highlighted in the notes on the text below.

The manuscripts have other heterodox associations. MS D contains an anonymous Lollard treatise on matrimony.¹⁴⁷ In addition, both MSS C & D include a Lollard text, "Of maydenhod." Possession of such material was recognized as a key way of identifying heretics and thus they are unlikely to have been casual acquisitions. The option of burning religious dissenters at the stake had been highlighted by *De heretico comburendo* (1401) and although this sanction was not widely used the possibility ensured that people did not lightly keep forbidden works.

In itself, the regard for a work attributed to Augustine is no help in determining the religious opinions of the translator or the subsequent owners of the manuscripts. Lollardy was not defined by a strict principle of *sola scriptura*. Although MS C's theo-

¹⁴³ I use the term "Lollard" with the *caveat* that it does not stand for a perfectly homogenous set of beliefs. Whether or not "Lollard" can be usefully employed has been the subject of some debate, but a defence of its nuances cannot be mounted here. The best treatment is Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford 1988). See also my forthcoming chapter, "Known men? The Identification of Lollards and their Works," in Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin and John Flood eds., *Heresy and Orthodoxy in Early English Literature* (Dublin 2010).

¹⁴⁴ *Catalogue of the Harleian Collection* 2.655.

¹⁴⁵ Anne Hudson, *Lollards and Their Books* (London 1985) 251.

¹⁴⁶ Possession of a part of the Wycliffite Bible did not entail heterodoxy: many surviving MSS open with tables tying them to the Sarum Missal. Christopher De Hamel, *The Book. A History of the Bible* (London 2001) 179. Copies were also held by orthodox religious houses, for example, one was given by Henry VI to the Carthusians in London. See Conrad Lindberg, ed., *King Henry's Bible MS Bodley 277: The Revised Version of the Wyclif Bible*, vol. 1 (Stockholm 1999). Other copies owned by religious houses or members of the royal family are noted in Mary Dove, *The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions* (Cambridge 2007) 53–54, 44.

¹⁴⁷ Found in Thomas Arnold, ed., *Select English works of John Wyclif*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1869–1871) 188–201.

logical texts derive from a wide range of sources (including St. Jerome, Pseudo-Bernard, Aelred of Rievaulx, and Thomas Aquinas), these figures commanded general respect and need not be certain markers of orthodoxy or heterodoxy.¹⁴⁸ On the other hand, the presence of a Latin work (attributed to Bernard) on the dignity of priests tends to suggest a more traditional orientation. Unfortunately, MS C was rebound in 1935. While it is clear that it is composed of a number of booklets, it can no longer be said whether or not they were bound together in the fifteenth century. It is possible that *De imagine Dei* and some of the English material in the same booklet were of Lollard origin and were subsequently bound with a miscellany of other material.

CHOICE OF PRINCIPAL MS

The MSS are for the most part carefully written, although the scribe of C has succumbed to the dittography of a substantial phrase (see variants below). In addition, scribe C had to return and add some words which were originally omitted. Although the C text is the most divergent of the four, it is clearly the same translation. With only four manuscripts to work with, it cannot usefully be speculated that C belongs to a separate tradition (no plausible stemmatic representation of the texts' relationship to one another is possible). The divergences of C, its relatively late date and its errors make it an unlikely candidate for the base text of this edition.

Given that the texts of *De imagine Dei* in ABD are similar, MS D, the earliest of the manuscripts, has been chosen as the basis of this edition of the Middle English translation. D is not perfect (e.g., it has a dittographic "pis" in l. 57), but it provides an early and clear text. As there is a relatively small amount of variation between the MSS (and when it exists, it tends to be of a minor nature) a "best text" approach has been adopted.

EDITORIAL CONVENTIONS

Initial *v* and *i* have been replaced with *u* and *j* where appropriate, otherwise the original orthography has been retained. Modern punctuation and capitalization have been substituted for MS D's use of the comma, colon, *punctus elevatus* and virgule. Abbreviations are expanded in italics. A folio number alone indicates a recto page and verso pages are marked "v." Editorial material appears in square brackets []. The line numbers refer to this edition and not to the manuscript.

¹⁴⁸ The Lollard *Glossed Gospels* draw *inter alia* on Ambrose, Aquinas, Bede, Bernard, Chrysostom, Gregory, Grosseteste, and Jerome.

TEXT OF CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MS II.VI.55 (MS D)

[fol. 63v] How grete is þe dignete of *manus* makyng. It is knowen þat not bi word alone of God biddynge man is maad of nouȝt [fol. 64] as oþere werkis of sixe dayes, but bi councel of þe Hooly Trynyte and werk of Goddis maieste, þat he schulde knowe of þe honor of þe first makyng, hou myche he ouȝte to his maker þe while his maker

5 ȝaf to hym so greet pryuylege of dignete anoon in his makyng, þat by so myche he schulde loue more *brennyngly* his maker – bi hou myche he undirstood hym silf maad of hym more wondurly – he seiþ, “make we man to oure ymage and licnesse.” Not for þis þing onely, þat by councel of þe Hooly Trinyte man is so maad of þe excellence of his maker, but þ^t þe maker of nouȝt of alle þingis maad man of nouȝt to his ymage ȝ

10 licnesse, whiche þinge he ȝaf to noone oþere of creatures, whiche ymage is to biholdun diligently by nobley of þe *ynner man*, þat is þe soule. First soþely þ^t as oo God is euere more euerywhere al, quyckenynge alle þingis, mouyng ȝ *gouernyng* as þe postle *confermeþ* “þ^t in hym we lyuen *ben* mouyd and *ben*,” so þe soule þryueþ or lyueþ euerywher al in his body, quykenynge it, mouynge and *gouernyng*. Treuly it is

15 not more *in* more membris of his body and lesse in lesse membris; but in þe lest it [fol. 64v] is al and in þe most al, and þis is þe ymage of unyte of Almyȝty God whiche þe soule haþ in it silf. Also þe soule haþ *sum* licnesse of þe Holy Trynyte. First in þat þing þ^t as God is, lyuiþ and undirstondiþ, so þe soule up his *maner* is lyueþ ȝ undirstondiþ. Also and anoþer licnesse of þe Trynyte is in þe soule, for it is maad to þe ymage of his maker, soþely *perfit* ȝ *hiȝeste* Trinyte whiche is in Fadir, Sone and Hooly Goost. And þouȝ þe soule be of oo kynde, neþeles it haþ þre dignetees in it silf; þat is undirstondynge, wille ȝ mynde, which þing is signefied þouȝ bi oþer wordis in þe Gospel whanne it is seid “þou schalt loue þe Lord þi God of al þi herte ȝ of al þi soule ȝ of al þi mynde”; þat is of al þin undirstondynge ȝ of all þi wille ȝ of al þi

20 mynde. For why as of þe Fadir þe Sone is gendrid, and of þe Fadir ȝ Sone þe Holy Goost comeþ forþ, so by undirstondynge wille is gendrid and also of þese tweyne comeþ forþ mynde, as it may liȝtly ben undirstonden of ech wise man. Treuly þe soule may not be parfyt wiþ out þes þre, neþer ony of þes þre as myche as *perteyneþ* to his blisse is hool or ful wiþ oute oþere tweyne. And as [fol. 65] God þe Fadir, God þe Sone, God þe Hooly Goost neþeles ben not þre goddis, but oo God hauynge þre

25 *persones*, so ȝ þe soule is undirstondynge, þe soule is wille, þe soule is mynde. Neþeles, not þre soulis ben in oo body, but oo soule haþ þre dignetes and in þes þre þingis oure *ynner man* – þat is soule – beriþ wondurly þe ymage of God þe Trynyte. Of þes þingis, as þe more excellent dignetees of soule, we ben comaundid to loue

30 God, þat hou myche he is undurstond he be had euer in mynde. Neþer undirstondynge alone sufficiþ, no but wille be maad in his loue. ȝhe neþer þes twey sufficien, no but mynde be put to bi whiche euer in mynde of man undurstondynge and louynge God dwelliþ as no moment may be in whiche þe mynde haue not hym present and þis þing haue p^u of þe ymage. Now soþely undirstonde þ^u *sum* þingis of þe licknesse of God

35 which is to be biholdun in *virtues* or *condiciouns*. Þat as God þat made of nouȝt man to his licnesse is charite, is good and just ȝ pacient, mylde, clene ȝ *merciful* and oþere nobleys of his *virtues* þat ben red of hym, so man is maad of nouȝt þat he schulde have charite and wer good [fol. 65v] and just, pacient, mylde, clene ȝ *merciful*,

40

45 whiche *virtues* bi hou myche ech *man* haþ more in hym silf, bi so myche he is neer to
 God and berip þe more licnesse of his maker. Soþely if þat God forbede ony *man* erre
 by wrong weies of vices and dyvorces of *crimes* þat is dampnable *synnes* fro þis
 nobleste licnesse of his maker and be unkynde, þanne it schal be maad þat is writun:
 “*man* undirstood not whanne he was in honor; he is licned to unwise beestis and is
 maad lik to *hem*.” What more honor myzt be to *man* þan þat he was maad to þe
 50 licnesse of his maker and was ourned w^t þe same cloþis of *virtues* by whiche and his
 maker was ourned? Hou hauntiþ not man and usiþ not in soule þe *mercy* and goodnes
 of God so no moment schal be *in* whiche he is not myndeful of God of whom it is red
 “þe Lord haþ regnyd, he is clopid wiþ fairnesse,” þat is, ourned wiþ schynynge of alle
 55 *virtues* and feirnesse of alle goodness? Eþer what may be more schenschip to *man*
 eþer unblisful wretchidnesse þan þat þis glorie of licnesse of his maker lost, he be
 drawen to þe unschaply ʒ unresonable licnesse of wielde unwise beestis? Wherefore
 ech *man* diligently biholde þe excellence or worþinesse [fol. 66] of his first making.
 Knowe he þe ymage of þe Hooly *Trinyte* in hym silf and stryue he to defende þe onor
 of licnesse to which he is maad of nouȝt by nobley of *condiciouns*, bi hauntyng of
 60 *virtues* and dignete of *meritis* or good werkis, þat whanne God schal appere at þe dom
 man appere lik to hym as he is now, whiche maad man wondrously to his licnesse in þe
 first Adam, and more wondrously reformyde or aȝen made in the secounde Adam þat is
 Crist.

NOTES (BY LINE NUMBER)

1. A rubricated “H” of 2–3 lines in height begins each of the MSS. The “n” at the end of “manus” is in red ink. **2.** “maad of nouȝt”: A common Middle English locution for God’s act of creation (and one not restricted to humankind). See Gen. 1.21: “And God made of nouȝt grete whallis.”¹⁴⁹ In the *Gilte Legende* we find “God made of naught man to his image and liknesse.”¹⁵⁰ **6.** “brennyngly” = ardently.¹⁵¹ **7.** Gen. 1.26. **11.** “soþely” = truthfully. See Rom. 7.22; Eph. 3.16. **13.** Acts 17.28: “in hym we lyuen, and mouen, and ben.” **23.** Mat. 22.37: “Thou schalt loue thi Lord God, of al thin herte, and in al thi soule, and in al thi mynde.” **39.** After “ymage” there is a space three characters wide in MS D. There is no visible sign of any deleted material. **40.** “condiciouns” = personal characteristics or dispositions. **48.** Ps. 48.13: “A man, whanne he was in honor, vnderstood not; he is comparisound to vnwise beestis, and he is maad lijk to tho.” **51.** “ourned” = arrayed with rich clothing; “haunt” = the habit of doing something;. **53.** Ps. 92.1: “The Lord hath regned, he is clothid with fairnesse.” **54.** “schenschip” = shame. **61.** See 1 John 3.2. **62.** For the second Adam see Rom. 5.12–21; 1 Cor. 15.21–22, 45–49.

VARIANT READINGS

The text from D has been compared with that in ABC. Material variations between this base text and ABC are recorded by line number where the lemma is from D unless otherwise indicated. The lemma is separated from the variants by]. Where judged useful, a reading from the Latin text is given as L. Where there is more than one variant reading in a line they are separated by ||. Where a manuscript is not mentioned in a list of variants it agrees with D. General exceptions to the listing of material variations are as follows: orthographic difference, punctuation, capitalization and abbreviation.

1. How grete .. .making] not in L **3–4.** knowe of þe] C: knowe þe **4.** maker þe while] B: maker: while **6.** vnderstood] C: vnderstondip **11.** to beholdun] A: to be biholden || þat is þe soul] not in L || soþely þ^t as oo God] C: soþli riȝt as a God **15.** his] B: þe **16.** most al] BC: most it is al **18.** God is, lyuiþ] C: God is ȝ lyueþ || up] C: on **20.** Fadir, Sone] C: Fader ȝ Sone **22.** signefied þouȝ be] C: signified/ be **23.** þe Lord] C: þi Lord **24.** mynde] After this C has the dittographic: þat is of al þi understondinge ȝ of al þi wille ȝ of al þi mynde **25.** why as] C: whi riȝt as || ȝ Sone] C: ȝ þe Sone **27.** wyse] not in L (possibly from *De spiritu et anima*) **31.** ȝ þe] C: þat þe **33.** is soule] C: is þe soule **34.** of soule] B: of þe soule **35.** Neþer] A: eþer **35–6.** undirstondynge alone sufficiþ] C: undirstondinge sufficiþ **36.** twey sufficien] C: two ben sufficient **40.** or *condiciouns*] C: or in *condicouns* **41.** is charite, is good and iust] C: is charite. ȝ iust ||

¹⁴⁹ All Scriptural quotation is from the later version of the Wycliffite Bible in Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden, eds., *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments...* 4 vols. (Oxford 1850).

¹⁵⁰ Richard Hamer, ed., *Gilte Legende*, 2 vols. EETS (Oxford 2006–2007) 991. See *ibid.* 1014.

¹⁵¹ Occasional words are glossed (on their first appearance) from the *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. Hans Kurath, Sherman M. Kuhn, and Robert E. Lewis (Ann Arbor 1952–2001).

mylde, clene] A: mylde. ȝ clene **43.** iust, pacient] A: iust ȝ pacient **44.** in hou] B: bi
how **50.** and was ourned w^t] C: ȝ whas honou^{red} ȝ entired w^t || whiche and his] C:
weche his **51.** ourned] C: honou^{red} **51-2.** Hou...myndeful of God] Not in L **53.** þat is,
ourned] C: þt ourned **54.** *virtues* and feirnesse] A: *virtues.* feirnesse **55.** vnblisful] B:
unbileeful L: *infelicio^r* || þat þis] D: þat þis þis AB: þat þis C: þat is || maker lost] A:
maker be lost || he be] A: he is **56.** vnwise] C: vnresounable **57.** or worþinesse] C: or
þe worþinesse **62.** first Adam] A: first man Adam L: *in primo Adam* **62-63.** þat is
Crist] A: þat is in Crist L: absent from text.