

containing it did exist, some of them very ancient and splendid copies. It says a great deal for Ubertino's intelligence that he noted this reading together with other peculiarities of the old codex, and that then he had a reference to it ready when he wanted it many years later. His statement about the old codex which he reports *oculata fide* is credible to the specialist now, more credible than it must have seemed to Papini about 1820 or to the Papal Court at Avignon in 1311, and therefore it seems reasonable to believe his statement about Brother Leo's *rotuli*, which he also claims to have seen.

As for the degree of accuracy to which Ubertino attains, we may note that his quotation from Matt. xxvii drops a certain number of words and clauses *per incuriam*. Thus the old codex no doubt had *dicens* before *heli*, and *ex eis* before *currens unus*, and it almost certainly did not omit after *bibere* the clause *Ceteri uero dicebant sine uideamus an ueniat Elias liberans eum*. Probably also it read *aqua et sanguis*, with all the authorities except *Gat*. But these things do not affect the main issue, which is that Ubertino is not romancing, but giving an intelligent and intelligible account of something that he had really seen. The only thing that remains with me as a permanent surprise is that this champion of the strictest poverty should have managed to remain so well provided with documentary evidence. He was surely a very well learned man.

F. C. BURKITT.

ON A PLACE IN ST AUGUSTINE'S *RULE*.

IN the JOURNAL vol. xx p. 355, the present writer pointed out that the editor of the Vienna text of St Augustine's *Epistolae*, the veteran scholar Dr Alois Goldbacher, who at the ripe age of over eighty-four is still active and productive, has altered the reading in one all-important sentence so that it can no longer be used, as it was by earlier critics, to fix the date at which the *Rule* was written. *Apud* Goldbacher, this sentence (*Ep.* 211. 4) now reads:—

cogitate, quid mali sit, ut, cum de deo natis in unitate gaudeamus, interna schismata in monasterio lugeamus.

deo natus] *Donatistis* m. [= Ed. Maur].

That *Donatistis* is right and ought to be restored, it is the aim of this note to shew.

(1) The antithesis in the last two members of this sentence and the emphatic position of *interna* surely imply that the 'rejoicing in unity' is over those who, though external to the *monasterium*, were Christians before this time, though separate in communion. The rejoicing is caused, not by their conversion, but by their ceasing to be schismatics;

the phrase 'in unitate gaudere' is employed elsewhere (e.g. *Psalm. c. p. Don*, 160) over the return of Donatists; *unitas* itself, much like *Catholica*, is employed, during the Donatist controversy, in the semi-technical sense of *Ecclesia catholica* (see Petschenig's Index to C.S.E.L., vol. liii). The sense points then to the Donatists as being the source of the 'rejoicing in unity'; this itself is a weighty argument for *Donatistis*.

(2) For what can *deo natus*¹ here mean? Does it mean 'born of God'? In classical Latin certainly it does; Livy has the very phrase: *Deus deo natus* (i 16. 3). But 'born of God' as Scripture is not *Deo natus*, but either *natus ex Deo* (ἐκ) or *natus de Deo* (see Sabatier *ad locc*).² If Augustine here means 'converts', he has employed an unscriptural and unusual phrase: he very seldom (never, I might almost say) employs a bare ablative after *nasci*. Can *Deo* here be dative? Consider one or two analogous datives.

Nasci with dative is employed throughout all Latin in the sense 'born to, destined for': TERT. *de paenit.*, last sentence: *nec ulli rei nisi paenitentiae natus*; CARM. DE IONA PROPH. 3 *solis oculis nascentia poma*. COMMODIAN *Instr.* 2. 10. 7 is different: *in aluo recurrant | nascanturque quasi denuo suae matri de uentre*. *Mori peccato* (*peccatis, legi*) (dative) is Scriptural, and supplies such parallels as *saeculo mori* (e.g. to name only one or two that are at hand, PS.-HIER. *Ep.* 19. 15 *init*; 19. 20 *non nos mundo, sed mundus nobis mortuus est*; 'An Ancient Homiliary' in JOURNAL xvi (1914) p. 317 *mortuus saeculo and mortuus mundo*)³; TERT. *Resurr. Carn.* xix has *homo mortuus Deo*. *Viuere Deo* (dative) is Scriptural, and frequent (AVG. *In Ioan. Eu.* 26. 13 *uiuatur Deo de Deo*; PAVL. NOL. *Carm.* in *Ep.* 7, line 107 *uiue, precor, sed uiue Deo* (*uiuere mundo*, cf. *Ep.* 23. 21). Such phrases as these were soon paralleled: TERT. *Resurr. Carn.*, *ut supra*, has *redanimatus et reuiuificatus Deo*; PS.-HIER. *Ep.* 27. 1 (*P. L.* xxx 223 A, B) has an interesting collection: *perire sibi existimans (diabolus) quidquid Christo saluatur, et mori Synagogae suae quidquid Ecclesiae uiuificatur*. In Augustine the following datives are analogous: *Conf.* 12. 14. 17 *sic amo eos occidi sibi ut uiuant Tibi*; *In Ioan. Eu.* 60. 3 *timeat ne pereant homines Christo, contristetur cum perit aliquis Christo*; . . . *timeat et sibi ne pereat Christo*; C. *Gaud.* 2. 4. 4 *perire quemquam Christo*, and with the uncommon word *repuerasco*: *ab his ad seipsam colligat (anima) et repuerascat Deo*, *Quant. An.* 28. 55.

But does Augustine employ *nasci* with the dative? In the MS

¹ The *de* is to be taken, of course, with *gaudeamus*, as e.g. in the refrain of the *Psalmus*: *omnes qui gaudent de pace*. . .

² Pontius *Vit. Cypr.* 2. 1 has *natus Deo*, but it is not easy to say whether *Deo* is ablative or dative; probably it is abl., the *ex* being omitted for euphony after *ex quo*.

³ Cf. Aug. *Ep.* 10. 3 *amori corporeo animus moritur*.

Concordance to St Augustine¹ prepared by the great P. Odilo Rottmanner, O.S.B., I find two examples, to which I can add only one:—

Pecc. Mer. ii 24. 38 ut Deo nascerentur ex Deo, qui prius nati fuerant ex carne saeculo. (*vid. sqq.*)

C. Iul. vi 2. 4 propter quod [*sc.* peccatum] omnis homo prius mundo, non Deo nascitur, et ut Deo nascatur, de mundo eligitur . . .

Nupt. et Concup. i 19. 21 mundo, non Deo nascitur; Deo autem nascitur cum *ex aqua et spiritu* renascitur.

These examples, all I know in Augustine, shew clearly that when Augustine does use *Deo nasci* (dative), he employs it in a context which prevents all obscurity, and in apposition with *mundo* (*et sim.*). We may conclude that, while *Deo nasci* is Augustinian, neither the first reason advanced nor this second allows it the place Goldbacher has given it in this sentence of the *Rule*.

Non otiose, as St Ambrose says so often, have I put forward this grammatical discussion: it serves to introduce a more weighty matter, namely, another point of view of Regeneration. The dative with *nasci* carries further the often-quoted *fecisti nos ad Te* (*Conf.* i. 1) and illustrates his frequent *Deo adhaerere, inhaerere*. Regeneration has not only God as source (*ex Deo*) but God as aim and end: we are born again *to* or *unto* God, a fact borne out by experience. A regenerate (if the word may be used) is usually less conscious of God as the *source* of his new-found life, than of the God he has discovered as Friend.

To sum up, the reasons given above are unanimous in recommending the restitution of the Maurist *Donatistis*, which Goldbacher ejected on the testimony of his manuscripts. The earliest of these, for this introductory section, is thirteenth-century, so their authority need not count much against reason. If *Donatistis* was given by the archetype, as seems certain, the omission of the second group of similar letters (*Dona-tis-tis*) easily explains the corruption. A similar error occurs in *De Baptismo* iii 1. 1 (p. 197. 1 Petschenig): *pro Donatistis esse proponendam*, where L (Sangall. 158, saec. ix) gives *Donatis*.

J. H. BAXTER.

P.S.—Since writing, I have come upon several similar datives, of which the most interesting is Ps-Avg. *Hypomn.* i 2. 3 Deo dormiunt quos diabolus perisse putabat.

¹ The use of which I owe to the kindness of Abt Bonifaz Woehrmueller, O.S.B., of Munich, who has put it into my hands for combining with my own large collections into a vast Augustinian *Index Rerum et Verborum*, which, helped by Professor Souter's extensive lexicographical collections during a quarter-century, will some day, I hope, see the light. Meantime I shall be glad, as will Dr Souter, to consult our respective collections for any scholar interested.