

<Text 5>

(*Cat*, 41)

An Outline of the Church Teachings of this same Council

<I.> Concerning the Trinity, which is not confused in one person.

We believe that there is one God, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; a Father by the fact that he has a Son; a Son by the fact that he has a Father; a Holy Spirit by the fact that it is with the Father and with the Son.¹ The Trinity is not confused in one person, as Sabellius says, nor is the divinity separated or diverse in nature, as Arius blasphemes.

<II.> Concerning the one Son, whom we call only-begotten, remaining in two substances.

The Father did not assume flesh, nor the Holy Spirit, but only the Son. Born from the Father, he is the Son of God according to the truth of his nature from God; and according to the truth of his nature from man, he is the Son of man, as the truth of one begotten is not by adoption, not by appellation; but in each nativity by being born he is Son, so that he is true God and true man, one Son.

<III.> Nor was he born from a virgin in such a way that by being born as a man he would receive the beginning of his deity, but the eternal God was born man from a virgin.

¹ "Spiritum Sanctum eo quod sit cum Patre et cum Filio". See Text 4, footnote 1.

<IIII.> Concerning the perfect Trinity.

In the Trinity there is nothing created or serving, nothing greater or less², nothing with unequal grace, nothing invisible to itself, nothing visible to creatures, nothing diverse in motion or will, nothing singular in function and not communicable to another, nothing confused, but it is entirely perfect, because entirely of one and in one.

<V.> Concerning `consubstantial`.

In the divinity the Son is consubstantial to the Father, and the Holy Spirit is consubstantial to the Father and the Son; the one Son is consubstantial to God and to man, remaining God in his humanity in the glory of the Father, not a man near God or Christ with God, as Nestorius blasphemes, but man in God and God in man.

VI. Concerning the fact that the resurrection of the dead, that is, of the just and sinners, will be one and the same.

VII. Concerning the fact that all will rise because all die, since some say that those who are found living at the end of the world will not die but will be changed, with their souls remaining in their bodies; that their change is their resurrection.

² *Symb. Athan.*

VIII. Concerning the living and the dead being judged, that is, those who are found living will be judged equally with the already dead.

We understand `living' and `dead' are said for the just and sinners, not like Dioscorus.³

VIII. That we do not believe there is a future restitution after the resurrection and judgment, as Origen drives.

X. Concerning the fact that in the beginning God created heaven and earth and the water from nothing; and when darkness still hid the water, and the water hid the earth, the angels were made; and so this visible world was adorned from these things which had been made.

XI. God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is believed to be incorporeal, because God is everywhere and fills and constrains all things.

XII. We believe that angels are corporeal without flesh because they are circumscribed in location, just as are human souls, which are enclosed in flesh, and demons, who are in substance of an angelic nature.

XIII. Concerning the fact that we believe intellectual natures are immortal because they lack flesh.

³ This is the exact opposite of what Gennadius says in his 8th c.; see commentary below.

XIII. Concerning the fact that human souls were not created from the beginning with the rest of the intellectual creatures, or all at once, as Origen imagines, nor sown with bodies through coitus. But we say that only the body, sown through the bond of marriage, by the true judgment of God is coagulated in the womb and composed and formed; and that with the body already formed, the soul is created or poured in, so that a human lives in the womb.

XV. Concerning the fact that there is one soul in a person, which both vivifies the body and orders itself with reason, having free will.

XVI. Concerning the fact that we ought to believe that only a human has a substantial soul, which lives when the body has been put off.

XVII. Concerning the fact that animals do not have substantial souls, but they originate with the flesh, with the vivacity of the flesh, and with it they die.

XVIII. Concerning the fact that the human soul does not die with the flesh because it is not sown with the flesh.

XVIII. Concerning the fact that a human being consists of two substances, of a soul with its reason and flesh with its seed.

XX. Concerning the fact that the spirit is not a third substance of a human being; but the third thing, the spirit that, according to the Apostle, is put on with the soul (cfr I Thess. 5, 23), we understand to be the grace of the Holy Spirit.

XXI. Concerning the fact that humankind, when it was created, received free will so that it would persist in that condition in which it had been created. But after it sinned, it lost the good of its nature and equally the strength of will; not, however, choice, lest it would not be its sin which it should emend, nor rightly would that be forgiven which it did not do away with by its own will. Thus, free will remains to seek salvation, but not to obtain it without that one who makes the seeking find (cfr Mt. 7, 7; Lk. 11, 9). Therefore, just as we believe we can initiate our salvation with God's mercy and inspiration, so we freely confess that the human will follows upon divine inspiration. Thus, it belongs either to our nature or our work of solicitude and equally to divine aid that we do not fall from the good: that we do fall belongs to our power and idleness.

XXII. That these who are baptized among heretics in the name of the Trinity should not be rebaptized; but these who are not baptized in the name of the holy Trinity, if they should come to us, we order to be baptized, not rebaptized.

XXIII. Reception of daily communion I do not praise or disparage. I encourage communicating on all Sundays, as long as, however, the heart is not in a disposition of sinning. For I say that someone still having the desire of sinning will be more weighed down by the reception of the Eucharist than purified. And therefore, although someone may be bitten with sin, let that one,

about to communicate, not have the desire of sinning from now on, and make amends with tears and prayers, and, trusting in the mercy of the Lord, who is accustomed to forgive the sins of a devout confession, approach the Eucharist without fear and secure. But I am speaking about that one whom capital and mortal sins do not weigh down. For the one overcome by mortal sins committed after baptism, I urge that one first to make amends with public penance, and thus reconciled by the judgment of a priest, to be united to the communion, if that one wishes to receive the Eucharist not to judgment and condemnation (cfr I Cor. 11, 34). But also we do not deny that mortal sins can be cancelled by private satisfaction. But, by changing the previous secular dress and having confessed a desire for sanctity through correction of life and, indeed, by lamentation of the yoke and by God's mercy thus so that at least for these things which are repented the contrary is not done, let them receive the Eucharist, suppliant and submissive, every Sunday up until death.

XXVIII. True penance is not to admit what needs to be repented, but to weep at what has been admitted. The satisfaction of penance is in order to cut off the causes of sins, and not to grant access to their suggestions.

XXV. That we do not believe that after the resurrection there will be marriages, or necessary foods, or two resurrections.

XXVI. Concerning the will of God and free will.

We believe that no one comes to salvation without God inviting; that no one invited works his salvation without God aiding; that no one deserves aid without praying; that no one perishes by the will of God, but by free choice with God's permission, lest the noble character of the power first given to humankind is forced to servile necessity.

XXVII. Concerning that evil or malice is not made by God, but invented by the devil, and from him evil passed into the rest of rational creatures.

XXVIII. We believe that nothing is unchangeable in nature except God alone.

XXVIII. Concerning angels, that they possess good not by nature, but they obtained sanctity by their free will.

XXX. Concerning the fact that marriages are good, but for the sake of children and by checking the pretext of fornication.

XXXI. That continence is better, if, however, it is chosen, with God calling, for the sake of love.

XXXII. That virginity excels both of these goods, which conquers nature by the integrity of the body, and the struggle by the peace of chastity.

XXXIII. Concerning the fact that it is good to take food with thanks according to time and need; to abstain, however, from some foods, not as if they are evil but as if they are unnecessary, is

not wrong. Indeed, it belongs to a Christian to moderate the use of these according to time and need.⁴ *For I gave you all green-growing plants for food, as if vegetables, except that you shall not eat flesh with blood; for I will require a reckoning for your lifeblood from every beast* (Gn. 9, 3–5). This sentence is taken from the book of Genesis, just as the Lord said to Noah.

⁴ On the entire Text, cfr GENNAD., *Dogm.* 1-32 (p. 89-96). There are many differences from Turner's edition of Gennadius, *Dogm.*, which is only one recension; there are at least two recensions (see *CPPM* II A 174). Turner did not know Z. For example, lines 150/154 ('tradidi – noe') are not found in Turner's edition.

Commentary on Text 5

C. H. Turner, in his working edition of *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* (DED), describes this text as “a tract which during many generations was one of the most popular handbooks of Christian doctrine in the Western Church” (*JTS*, 7, 1905–1906, p. 78). This can hardly be an exaggeration, if one considers the dozens of mss of the work, its numerous recensions, its attributions to such renowned authorities as Augustine, Isidore, and the first Council of Nicea, and its reworking or extensive borrowing in other tracts. A critical edition is greatly desired, but a fearsome task, and probably one could never collect all the mass that employ Gennadius’ work wholesale or in part. For the composers that reworked the DED, the chapters they chose to retain or omit, and what they changed of the ones they retained, can tell us what interested them and what did not. We can then speculate as to why.

Text 5 is an abbreviated form of the first 32 chapters of Gennadius (Gennadius has 54 chapters according to Turner’s edition). Could Text 5 be incomplete (in its one known ms it has no explicit), or did the composer have an incomplete text of Gennadius before him, or did the composer intentionally omit the remainder of Gennadius? In its one known ms Text 5 ends on f. 127r, line 4 of the ms. After one blank line the title “CAPITULA” and a list of the ten chapters is followed by the text itself of Halitgar of Cambrai, *Paenitentiale libri sex*, 2.; thus, only an extract of Halitgar’s entire work. Also, the text preceding Text 5 is ALCVINVS, *De Trinitate ad Fredegisum quaestiones* 28 (*Cat*, 73), but only questions 1–12. This seems intentional, because it ends in the middle of f. 122v, and the title of Text 5 begins on the next line. In fact, all of the texts between f. 64-123 in this ms are extracts of works. The ms is Zürich, ZB, Rh. 102, s. IX and X, composed of three codices: f. 1r-63v, 64r-136v = s. IX; f. 137r-200v = s. X. Each codex was written by a single hand. 200 f.; 190 x 138 mm.; 20 lines. The second codex (f. 64-136) begins with *Cat*, 204c.

Perhaps a book of instruction for a cleric in a monastic school.

f. 1r-45r = n. **92 (Fulgentius, De fide ad Petrem)**;

f. 45v-56v = martyrology (= oldest calendar of Rheinau); computus;

f. 57r-98r = n. **73, 204c (2 excerpts from Aug on the Trinity), 115a (Paschasius Radbertus, Ep. 9, De assump. BVM, excerpts), 10 (Isidore, Orig. VII. i-iv, beginning incompl.), 122a (Isid., Diff. 2, i-vi)**;

f. 98r-115v = Isidore, *Sententiarum libri tres*, I;

f. 115v-120v = Bede, *De temporum ratione*, 69-70 (De temporibus Antichristi; De die iudicii);

f. 121r-127v = n. **73** (*sic*, again; here only questions 1-12), **41 (= Text 5)**;

f. 127v-136r = Halitgar of Cambrai, *Paenitentiale libri sex*, 2;

f. 136r = a gloss in OHG: “fibula Teutonice nuscha” (the OHG word for a clasp or brooch or clamp).

Thus, based on the surrounding material, it appears that Text 5 was intended to be a large extract of Gennadius. Our composer’s model may have also been an extract of Gennadius. It is clear, in any case, that our composer did not pick and choose from the 54-chapter version of Gennadius, because Text 5 has all of Gennadius’s first 32 chapters, in the same sequence, and none of chapters 33–54.

Gennadius’s chapters cover the following topics:

1. Trinity
2. incarnation
3. incarnation
4. Trinity
5. Christ homousius to God and man
6. our resurrection
7. our resurrection
8. “living and dead”
9. last judgment
10. creation of the world from nothing

11. God incorporeal and invisible
12. all creatures corporeal, including intellectual natures
13. intellectual natures are immortal
14. human souls created not in the beginning or all at once, or sown with body
15. 1 soul, not 2, in humans
16. only humans have substantive soul that does not die
17. animals do not have substantive souls
- 17b. human souls are created and poured into already formed bodies
18. humans consist of 2 substances, soul and body
19. no 3rd spirit, but = grace of Holy Spirit
20. free will and our share in our salvation
21. baptism and rebaptism
22. daily eucharist and eucharist for penitents
23. true penance
24. heaven not material; no millennium on earth with 2 resurrections
25. free will and God's invitation
26. evil and the devil
27. God alone has an unchangeable nature, which is good
28. angels persevere in goodness by will, not by nature
29. marriages good
30. continence better
31. virginity best
32. food and abstinence

33. wrong to call marriage or foods evil

34. marriages consecrated to God = virginity; abstaining from wine or meat does not increase merit

35. Mary remained a virgin post partum

36. heaven and earth will not be abolished, but changed

37. giving to the poor

38. impediments to becoming ordained

39. bodies of saints, relics of martyrs, and their basilicas must be honored

40. baptism compared to martyrdom, a substitute

41. water and wine, not just water, in Eucharist

42. our flesh is good in substance; it is made good or evil for us by our will

43. we keep our sex in the resurrection

44. before the Passion the souls of all the saints were held in inferno

45. after the Ascension the souls of all the saints, going out from their bodies, are with Christ

46. penance abolishes sin, even in last moment of death

47. the devil does not see the internal thoughts of the soul

48. evil thoughts don't always come from the devil, but sometimes from our own will

49. demons don't inhabit the soul substantially

50. sinners also perform signs, and healings

51. Christians become holy through temperance and peaceful living, not signs

52. all the saints and the just do not lack sin

53. Easter celebrated not before spring equinox

54. how we are 'image' and 'likeness' of God

Text 5

Title: If the title is original, the composer of Text 5 seems to have been reporting the acts of a council, but the title might be simply taken from the version of Gennadius before his eyes, since one recension of Gennadius mentions the Nicene Council in the title (see Turner, p. 81–82). For example, Paris, BnF 10612 (s. VIII): “Incipit doctrina dogma ecclesiastica secundum Nicaenum concilium.” Another compound title comes closer to Text 5, with its words “definitio dogmatum”: “Incipit liber beati Augustini, siue ut alii uolunt Gennadii presbyteri Massiliensis, uel certe diffinitio dogmatum aecclesiasticorum Niceni concilii in regulis lvi ad aedificationem catholicae fidei” (Milan, BA G. 58. Sup (s. ix-x)).

c. 1. Text 5 has only an extract of DED, c.1. The emphasis in both texts is the distinction of the three persons, yet the oneness of God in nature. The most striking change from Gennadius is the expression, “Spiritum Sanctum eo quod sit cum Patre et cum Filio.” “With” the Father and “with” the Son is a variation of Gennadius that avoids the word “proceeding” altogether (DED has: “the Holy Spirit, because it is proceeding from the Father, coeternal to the Father and Son”). See my commentary on Text 3 for more on this change of Gennadius in relation to the filioque.

c. 2. = extract of DED, c.2. The extract includes the phrase, “not by adoption, not by appellation.”

c. 3. = DED, c. 3, almost entire, except omitting the heretics’ names.

c. 4. = DED, c. 4, selectively; what Text 5 keeps is the equality in the Trinity; the visibility to itself but not to creatures, the sharing of motion, will, office, no confusion, entire perfection.

c. 5. = DED, c. 5, except omits DED's Scripture reference.

c. 6. = DED, c. 6, sentence 1, but whereas Gennadius says: "There will be a resurrection of the dead, but it will be one and at once, not first of the just and second of sinners, as the dreamer invents, but one of all." Text 5 has: "Concerning the fact that the resurrection of the dead, that is, of the just and sinners, will be one and at once." Text 5 omits the rest of c. 6, which refers to Origen and erroneous thoughts about the resurrection of our bodies (Origen denies "this same flesh").

c. 7. = DED, c. 7; a paraphrase of the whole chapter about some say not all will die, but their change will be their resurrection. Gennadius attributes this thought to "equally catholic and erudite men" against a "great crowd of the fathers" (note that Gennadius makes room in the tradition for opposing viewpoints), but Text 5 just says "some say", leaving out "equally catholic and erudite men."

c. 8. cfr DED, c. 8. Gennadius says that Diodorus thinks that the phrase "the living and the dead" in the creed refers to the just and the sinners, but rejects Diodorus's view, and says: "<the creed> calls living those who are found in the flesh, who for this reason are believed to be about to die (or be changed, as some wish), so that immediately raised (or changed) they may be judged with the already dead." ("Quod autem dicimus in symbolo, in aduentum Domini 'uiuos ac mortuos iudicandos,' non 'iustos ac peccatores iudicare,' sicut Diodorus significari putet, sed 'uiuos' eos qui in carne inueniendi sunt dicit, qui ad hoc morituri creduntur (uel inmutandi, sicut alii uolunt) ut suscitati continuo (uel reformati) cum ante mortuis iudicentur"). But the composer of Text 5 seems to have misunderstood Gennadius. Our composer says: "We understand 'the living and the dead' is said for 'the just and the sinners,' not like Dioscorus." Our composer got Diodorus's name wrong, but he also got what Diodorus said wrong. In any case he teaches that 'the living

and the dead' in the creed do stand for the just and the sinners. Let us see what our other Texts say about this. Text 42 has: "Moreover, that he is said TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD⁵ does not mean that some will come to the judgment living, others will come to the judgment dead, but that he will judge body and soul at the same time, in which the living are the souls, and the dead are the bodies, just as the Lord says: *Do not fear those who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul* (Mt. 10, 28).⁶ Differently, they say the living are the saints, the dead are the sinners.⁷ Text 10 has: "Augustine. WHENCE HE WILL COME TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD.⁸ We believe he will come from there at the most fitting time, and will judge the living and the dead: whether the just and sinners are signified by these names, or whom he will find at that time on earth before their death are called the living, but the dead those who at his coming will be resurrected. This temporal dispensation not only is, just as that divine generation, but also was and will be. For our Lord was on earth, and now he is in heaven, and he will be in glory the judge of the living and the dead. For thus he will come, just as he ascended, according to the authority which is contained in the Acts of the Apostles. Therefore, it speaks of this temporal dispensation in the Apocalypse, where it is written: *These things he says, who was and who is and who is to come* (cfr Rev. 4, 8).⁹ Text 30 has: "WHENCE HE WILL COME TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD.¹⁰ The very man, God, Son of God, who conversed with humans in

⁵ *Symb. Ap.*

⁶ From "Moreover that he": RVFIN., *Symb.* 31 (p. 166, 8/13)

⁷ From "Differently": cfr VEN. FORT., *Expos. fid.* (p. 38, 15/16); see also PS.-ALCVIN., *Diu. off.* 41 (col. 1273B, 29/30)

⁸ cfr *Symb. Ap.*

⁹ From "We believe he will come": cfr AVG., *Fid. et symb.* 8, par. 15 (p. 17, 10/21)

¹⁰ *Symb. Ap.*

the world, who never at any time was without the Father, he himself will come, as the angels said to the apostles: *Thus he will come in the same way as you saw him going into heaven* (Acts 1, 11), that is, in a cloud with angels and archangels¹¹ to judge the living and the dead.¹² Some say that the living are the just, who were predestined to eternal life, but the dead are sinners, who will be tortured with eternal death. But others say the living are those who the judge when he comes will find living in the flesh,¹³ and the dead are the resting. And elsewhere they say that the living and the dead mean the souls and the bodies, which equally must be judged. For concerning the coming of the Lord Malachi says: *Behold, the Lord almighty will come* (Mal. 3, 1); and Daniel: *Behold in the clouds of heaven as if the Son of man* (Dan. 7, 13); and that one: *Just as lightning goes out from the east, so will be the coming of the Son of man* (Mt. 24, 27).¹⁴ Text 32 has: WHENCE HE WILL COME TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD. In the very same body he will come for the judgment in which he ascended to heaven. THE LIVING AND THE DEAD. He judges Christians and pagans, the just and sinners, the faithful and the impious.¹⁵ WHENCE HE WILL COME TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD. What will he do there? There he will always be, nevertheless he will come in the day of judgment to judge the living and the dead, as the angels said to the apostles: *Thus he will come just as you saw him going into heaven* (Acts 1, 11), that is, in a cloud, with angels and archangels, and the

¹¹ From “as the angels said”:] *Apert. symb.* (p. 184, 25/27)

¹² From “WHENCE HE WILL COME”: cfr *De symb.* (p. 180, 22^{bis}/25^{bis})

¹³ “flesh”(carne)] I emended; the ms has “prison” (carcere); see, for example, Gennadius, *Dogm.* 8 (p. 91, 3): ‘Viuos, eos qui in carne inueniendi sunt’.

¹⁴ From “the living and the dead mean”: cfr VEN. FORT., *Carm.* (p. 257, 12/15)

¹⁵ From “WHENCE HE WILL”: inde - impios] Ps.-AVG., *Serm.* 242 (col. 2193, 3/6); “WHENCE” is preceded by [Aut] in the ms, and this is also found in Text 36.

rest. It calls ‘living’ those who are found living on the day of judgment, and ‘dead’ those who have died. And differently, the ‘living’ are the saints, the ‘dead’ are sinners, because there will be three crowds at the resurrection: the judges; the sinners; the impious. The judges are the apostles, over whom Christ is going to sit, as it was said: *Then he will sit on the seat of his majesty* (Mt. 25, 31), *and you also will sit* (Mt. 19, 28). The sinners are the Jews and the bad Christians. The impious are those who already have been judged.¹⁶

Text 35 has: “WHENCE HE WILL COME TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD.”¹⁷ He himself, God and man, the one Son of God, in that same form of a servant in which he associated with humans in the world, will come in the glory of his majesty to judge the living and the dead. The living are those living at his coming; the dead are all who died before the future judgment, and *in the twinkling of an eye* (1 Cor. 15, 52) will be resurrected so that *each one* may receive *according to her works* (Mt. 16, 27; Rev.2, 23).¹⁸

In sum, from our six Texts that offer an interpretation of ‘the living and the dead’ (Texts 5, 10, 30, 32, 35, 42), there are three possible interpretations: 1) a literal reading: the living = those still living on the day of Judgment, and the dead = those already dead; 2) a symbolic reading: the living = the just (or the saints), and the dead = the sinners; 3) a symbolic or metaphorical reading: the living = souls, the dead = bodies. Text 5 (just/sinners) and Text 42 (souls/bodies, or saints/sinners) explicitly reject the literal interpretation. Text 35 (and Gennadius) (then living/already dead) offer only a literal interpretation; the other Texts offer both a literal and symbolic interpretation. How

¹⁶ From “WHENCE HE WILL COME TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD. What will he do”: cfr *Apert. symb.* (p. 184, 23/33)

¹⁷ *Symb. Ap.*

¹⁸ From “The living are those”: see also Text 9, 45/50

problematic is it to say that sinners will be judged, or saints will be judged? Why wasn't everybody happy with simply the literal interpretation? It seems that we have three different traditions: an Augustinian tradition, which has both a literal interpretation and a symbolic one; a Rufinus tradition (*Expositio symboli*, c. 31) which explicitly rejects a literal interpretation and offers souls/bodies; and a Gennadius tradition, which explicitly rejects just/sinners and insists on the literal interpretation. Perhaps symbolic interpretations for 'the living and the dead' arose with the rejection of a last judgement by Origen. (Did he? Check. Read the article on the Last Judgement in NCE—then Rufinus might have followed Origen. I remember reading about what the judgment is, if you're already known as a sinner—maybe in my Xerox of Himmel, Hell, Fegfeuer.) Our Texts don't take up the question of what "Judgment" means in the phrase "He will come to judge the living and the dead." Yet Text 32 says: "there will be three crowds at the resurrection: the judges; the sinners; the impious. The judges are the apostles, over whom Christ is going to sit, as it was said: *Then he will sit on the seat of his majesty* (Mt. 25, 31), *and you also will sit* (Mt. 19, 28). The sinners are the Jews and the bad Christians. The impious are those who already have been judged."¹⁹ So, you can be already judged before the Last Judgment. And Text 30 says: "Some say that the living are the just, who were predestined to eternal life." By adding "predestined" it seems that the judgment will be more of a confirmation than a true judgment for some. People's understanding of what is going to happen at the Last Judgment is no small matter in pastoral care. If there is ever an area where the creedal faith is connected with one's actions in life, it should be the impending judgment. Universalism and predestinationism mess up a straightforward weighing of deeds and being cast into hell or received into heaven. Would these doctrines have affected our composers? For Gennadius, it seems his main concern was to refute heretics who said that there

¹⁹ From "WHENCE HE WILL COME TO JUDGE THE LIVING AND THE DEAD. What will he do": cfr *Apert. symb.* (p. 184, 23/33)

were two resurrections, first of the just, then of sinners. Since two resurrections would entail two separate crowds, one of the good, one of the bad, being raised at different times, one can see why he has to reject “the living and the dead” as meaning “the just and sinners.”

(We can note that by the time of the PRG-X, in c. 112, in an exposition of the Athanasian Creed, for “iudicare uiuos et mortuos” it comments: “Viuos appellat eos, quos in carne inueniet uiuos. Siue uiuos appellat iustos et mortuos peccatores” [*Pont. Rom.-Germ.* 2, CXII, n. 31, p. 185]).

c. 9 = DED, c. 9, 1st sentence.

c. 10 = DED, c. 10, but abbreviated

c. 11 = DED, c. 11, most of it

c. 12 = DED, c. 12, abbreviated

c. 13 = DED, c. 13, most of it.

c. 14= DED, c. 14, of some mss, which add that the bodies receive the soul after the bodies are coagulated and formed. (Text 5 omits the references to the heretics.)

c. 15 = DED, c. 15, extract

c. 16 = DED, c. 16, 1st sentence, leaving out ref to heretics.

c. 17 = DED, c. 17, 1st part, omits ref to Plato and Alexander

c. 18 = DED, c. 17b, extract (the 2nd part of 17b is more or less what the “some mss” of c. 14 add).

c. 19 = DED, c. 18, 1st half.

c. 20 = DED, c. 19, abbreviated.

c. 21 = DED, c. 20, abbreviated.

c. 22 = DED, c. 21, only an extract. Gennadius's c. has much more about professing faith before baptism and imposition of hands and sponsors and first Eucharist and all the heresies whose baptisms are invalid.

c. 23 = DED, c. 22 = entire, the same. This is quite amazing, because it is a very long chapter. Was the question of who could receive the Eucharist if you sinned an important question for our composer? (I think of the famous public penitent Louis the Pious.) Daily communion and public penance vs private penance are the 2 issues.

c. 24 = DED, c. 23, entire.

c. 25 = DED, c. 24, very abbreviated.

c. 26 = DED, c. 25, entire.

c. 27 = DED, c. 26, 2 extracts.

c. 28 = DED, c. 27, extract.

c. 29 = DED, c. 28, abbreviated.

c. 30 = DED, c. 29, entire

c. 31 = DED, c. 30, abbreviated.

c. 32 = DED, c. 31, entire but slightly reworded

c. 33 = DED, c. 32, entire.

The two most significant changes our composer (or his model) makes are 1) the Holy Spirit being “with the Father and with the Son” instead of Gennadius’s “proceeding from the Father”; and 2)

“the living and the dead” in the creed signifying the just and sinners, which Gennadius attributes to a heretic.

We can note that a little later in the PRG-X , in c. 112, in an exposition of the Athanasian Creed, for “iudicare uiuos et mortuos” it comments: “Viuos appellat eos, quos in carne inueniet uiuos. Siue uiuos appellat iustos et mortuos peccatores” (*Pont. Rom.-Germ. 2*, CXII, n. 31, p. 185).