Junillus Africanus held the office of Quaestor of the Sacred Palace under Justinian I from 542 to 548/549. For the dates of Junillus’s life and work, see Stein 1937; PLRE IIIA p 742; Honoré 1978 pp 239–40. His name is often given as Junilius in medieval sources and modern scholarship, but Stein (1937 pp 378–79) shows that Iunillus is the historically correct form. Little else is known about his life. Born in North Africa, he was acquainted with Fulgentius of Ruspe (Fulgentius’s Epistula 7 [CCSL 91.244–56] to Junillus’s kinswoman Venantia mentions a letter from Junillus that has not survived) and he corresponded with Fulgentius’s secretary, the deacon Ferrandus of Carthage (Epistula 12 to Junillus, PLS 4.39–40) (see Stevens 1982 pp 336–39; Maas 2003 p 29). An unflattering report by Procopius (Secret History 20.17–19, trans. Kaldellis 2010 p 92)—who claims that Junillus had small Greek and took bribes, making himself and the state a laughingstock—is usually discounted as prejudiced (e.g., Cameron 1985 p 233).

Although a layman, around 542 Junillus produced the Instituta regularia diuinae legis at the request of Primasius, bishop of Hadrumetum. As quaestor he also drafted legislation (all in Greek) for Justinian (see Honoré 1978 pp 237–40 and Meier 2003 pp 594–95). Kihn’s edition of the Instituta has been reprinted with a translation by Maas 2003 pp 118–235 (we cite from...
Kihn’s original edition as it is available on Google Books and so more accessible). Another translation by John F. Collins (n.d.) is available online. The work is also printed in PL 68.15–42 (from the 1565 editio princeps of Gast). Additional studies of the *Instituta* include Mannino 1991, Bienert 1999, Bruns 2000, and Martens and Bass 2016.

The two books of the *Instituta regularia* proceed in an orderly fashion, and Junillus makes use of the Aristotelian categories in defining the forms and modes of Scriptural discourse (see Bruns 2000 p 403; Maas 2003 p 3 n 8; Mathews *apud* Maas p 25). Book I takes up two major topics: first (I.i–x), the surface or external form (*superficies dictionis*) of Scriptural discourse, which is contrasted with the content (*res*) of its teachings (I.i and I.xi); and second (I.xii–xx), the ways that the Bible speaks about the essence of God and the Trinity and its three persons. The “surface” of Scripture is defined (I.i) as constituting the form of its discourse (*species dictionis*), its authority (that is, canonicity), its authors, its mode (poetry or prose), and its order (the Old and New Testaments). The *species dictionis* are subdivided into history, prophecy, proverbs (meaning figurative speech as in the Solomonic books), and simple teaching (*simplex doctrina*). Each of these is defined in considerable detail, along with lists of the biblical books that belong to each form. The content of Scripture’s teaching is subdivided into three topics: about God, about the present age, and about the future age. Book II then deals with the Bible’s teachings about the present age (II.i–xiii: the creation of the world; its governance by God, angels, and humans; and accidents of nature or will and their consequences) and about the future age (II.xiv–xxv: acceptance or calling by God; types or figures; and foretellings before the Law, under the Law, and under grace). Book II concludes (II.xxvi–xxx) with consideration of why the present age was created; how rational beings are taught (by things made, and by the four *species dictionis*); what things have to be observed in order to understand Scripture; what proofs there are of its divine inspiration; and why faith is necessary.

In his prologue, Junillus tells Primasius (whom he had met in Constantinople) that his treatise is based on a book of *regulae* by Paul the Persian (on the identification of this Paul—there are multiple candidates—and his connection with the school of Nisibis in Syria, see most recently Bruns 2009 and Haelewtyck 2010 pp 27–28). Some scholars have therefore concluded that Junillus was merely translating Paul’s lost work. At the very least, Junillus was responsible reframing Paul’s *regulae* in question-and-answer form, as he says so himself (Praef., 468.15–17). Maas further argues that as a *quaestor* Junillus was responsible for the work’s legalistic arrangement and methods (pp 67–75), and that as a partisan of Justinian he adopted an overtly “neo-Chalcedonian” stance against the Christology of THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA and the other “Three Chapters” authors whom Justinian had condemned (pp 9–11, 43–53, 60–66). Martens and Bass 2016 argue instead that Junillus avoided direct engagement with the controversy. They agree with Maas that Junillus adapted Paul freely, but they define his originality primarily in relation to ideas characteristic of North African Christianity.

Junillus’s *Instituta regularia* was one of the few sources for “Antiochene” literal biblical exegesis available in the West, transmitting concepts deriving from the school of Nisibis (for which see Bischoff and Lapidge 1994 pp 32–33; Mathews *apud* Maas 2003 pp 101–11; Becker 2008 and 2013). On Antiochene elements in Junillus’s exegesis see especially Martens and Bass 2016. The degree to which Junillus’s treatise reflects the exegetical methods of Theodore of Mopsuestia specifically has been disputed. Kihn as well as Pirot (in *DTC*) regard Theodore’s

CASSIODORUS, INSTITUTIONES I.x.1 (ed. Mynors 1937 p 34) recommended the *Institutula regularia* as an introduction to the study of Scripture, and he had it bound together with several other such works, including AUGUSTINE, DE DOCTRINA CHRISTIANA and EUCHERIUS, FORMULAE SPIRITALIS INTELLIGENTIAE and INSTRUCTIONES. Cassiodorus in Vivarium and Primasius in Hadrumetum (North Africa) would have been early sources for the transmission of the Institutula regularia. GREGORY THE GREAT in his *HOMILIAE IN EZECHIELEM* 1.1.1 (CCSL 142, 5) adopted (without attribution) Junillus’s scheme of the three temporal modes of prophecy (I.4.473.14—474.17) along with most of Junillus’s scriptural examples (Fiedrowicz 1995 p 347 n 115). The popularity of Junillus’s work is attested by 26 extant manuscripts (some of which transmit only parts or extracts). See Laistner’s list (1947 pp 24–26, supplementing Kihn p 466, and reproduced by Maas 2003 pp 116–17), to which add Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana F 60 sup. (s. viii, CLA 3.336; Gorman 2006 pp 229–32), which contains extracts (Reifferscheid 1865–72 1: 36; Siegmund 1949 p 107; see further below); Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19415 (s. ix; see Mordek 1995 p 355); Cesena, Biblioteca Comunale Malatestiana D.XXIV.1, fols. 183r–193v (s. xi; see Gorman 2002 p 268); and Vatican City, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 427, fols. 3v–39v (s. xv; cited in the *In Principio* database). The list of manuscripts in the entry for Junillus in the *Mirabile* database is incomplete, but provides bibliography on those included. Gast’s editio princeps was based on a lost manuscript from Murbach textually related to St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 130 (Kihn’s H, see p 300; Lehmhn 1911 p 166). Two Continental manuscripts may have been copied from Insular exemplars (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana I.1 sup.: CLA 3.348; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 19415: Bischoff 1960 p 103); another was produced “in a North Italian centre with Insular connections” (St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908: CLA 7.965). One of the ninth-century manuscripts (Paris, BnF lat. 1750, fols. 29–40) employs Insular abbreviations (Ganz 1990 pp 46 and 136), but according to Kihn this manuscript is a copy of Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 38 (s. ix), which apparently does not show Insular symptoms.

For medieval booklists that include Junillus’s work see Siegmund (1949 pp 107–8), Laistner (1947 pp 28–29), and Pollheimer (2015 p 124). Though no pre-Conquest English booklist mentions the *Instituta*, a Glastonbury list of 1247/48 records a “Liber Junillii. ut estus<us>” (Sharpe, et al. 1996 p 207 no 320), and Lapidge (ASL p 73) argues that the books characterized this way “were all Anglo-Saxon books of the tenth century or later” (ASL p 71). A Würzburg list dating to ca. 800 also lists a “liber iunili” (ASL p 149 no. 17), and Lapidge regards this list as reflecting “an earlier period of the Anglo-Saxon mission.” In manuscripts and booklists the heading of the first chapter of Book I, *De partibus divisae leges*, is sometimes used as the title for the work as a whole.

The transmission of the *Instituta* is surveyed broadly by Pollheimer 2015, who focuses on its manuscript contexts, noting that it often circulated with other basic instructional manuals such as those by EUCHERIUS, but also with Carolingian legislation. (A further Carolingian-era
quotation [from II.xvi, 200.11–13] occurs in the *Ordo de catechizandis rudibus* from the circle of Arno of Salzburg; ed. Bouhot 1980 p 221, §49; see p 235).

Despite the impressive number of surviving manuscripts and booklist entries, Laistner (1947 pp 29–31) stated that there is little concrete evidence for the actual use of Junillus by early medieval authors other than ALDHELM. Since Laistner’s study, however, it has been demonstrated that Junillus was used in several Hiberno-Latin compilations, as well as by BEDE and possibly also by CANDIDUS WIZO. How the work first reached England is unknown, but as a manual of literal biblical exegesis in the Antiochene tradition it would probably have appealed to THEODORE OF CANTERBURY and HADRIAN OF CANTERBURY, who may have brought a copy when they came to England. There are no quotations from Junillus in the CANTERBURY GLOSSES ascribed to their school, but at any rate their pupil ALDHELM had a copy of the work at Malmesbury (see below).

The Irish evidence should first be surveyed because it has never been fully detailed and because contacts with Irish scholars and manuscripts may have been another source of transmission to the English. We first specify the brief extracts in the Irish manuscript Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana F.60 sup., based on transcriptions and microfilm printouts supplied by David Ganz (private communication; we add one further extract on fol. 24v). These extracts were unknown to Kihn, and have been completely neglected (they are not mentioned in the description of the manuscript’s contents by Guglielmetti n.d.).

fols. 8v–9r: I.ii.471.9, 13–14; I.iii.472.2–3; I.iv.473.13–16; I.v.476.7–10; I.v.477.7–20, including definitions of three of the four superficies divinae legis (as Junillus’s terms are adapted here): *historia, profetia*, and *prouerbialis species*, including *alligoria*.

fol. 24v: II.i.493.14—494.3, on the three modes of creation.

fol. 66v (on two slips or schedulae): II.ii.493.14—494.1–13; 495.8–12; 497.19–21; 497.22–25; 494.15–17; 20–21; 498.2–3; 497.27–29, including passages on God’s different modes of creation and on the distinction between things created *ex nihilo* on the first day and things created after the first day from those things.

Slip before fol. 79: II.ii 495.12—496.7, with further discussion of the days of creation and of the differences between rational and non-rational creatures.

There is also a ninth-century copy of *Instituta* Book I written by an Irish scribe active in southern Germany (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14423, cf. Bischoff, *Katalog*, 2.3189).

The introduction to the commentary *De enigmatibus* (often called *Das Bibelwerk* or “The Reference Bible”) on the entire Bible incorporates substantial sections from both books of the *Instituta*. See Bischoff 1966 p 232, no. 1; HIBERNO-LATIN AND IRISH-INFLUENCED BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES, HOMILIES, AND FLORILEGIA, no. 1: PAUCA PROBLESMATA DE ENIGMATIBUS). One of Kihn’s manuscripts (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14276) and one of Laistner’s supplementary manuscripts (Vatican City,
Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 76) are in fact copies of De enigmatibus. See now the edition by MacGinty 2000 pp 13–25 (§§32–52, and parts of §§52–53). One of these extracts (II.ii, 495.22–23 and 497.25–26, 498.6–11) is also included in the partial copy of the “Recensio Breuior” of De enigmatibus in the early twelfth-century English manuscript Salisbury, Cathedral Library 115 (ed. McGinty p 235, §39; on the manuscript cf. Cross 1989; Webber 1992 pp 24, 38, 61, 159, 161–66, 168, 200; Gameson 1999 p 151 no. 855). See also MacGinty (p 51 §127 and p 63 §150) for two other passages from Junillus quoted by name within the De enigmatibus section on Genesis. Junillus is also quoted by name in its introduction to the Psalter (McNamara 1973 p 293) and in its commentary on Proverbs (McNamara 1987 pp 103–4). Junillus is also cited by name in the prefaces to Ruth, the Prophets, and the Gospels (see Wright, forthcoming). Another (unpublished) commentary on Genesis that has been identified as Hiberno-Latin quotes Junillus by name on the aqueous nature of the firmament (II.ii, 496.12–18; see Ó Cróinín 2001 pp 242–43).

The Eclogae Tractatorum in Salterium (HIBERNO-LATIN, no. 11; see Bischoff 1966 p 238, no 6b; McNamara 1973 pp 226, 287; Verkset 2001 p 267 n 1) and the Old-Irish Treatise on the Psalter (HIBERNO-LATIN, no. 12; ed. and trans. Meyer 1894 pp 22–23 §76) both adopt Instituta I.ii, 471.13–14 on the divisions of the superficies dictionis. See Ó Néill (1979 pp 157–59), who demonstrates that the term gnuis na canone (“species of the canon”) in the vernacular treatise is based on the De enigmatibus, where the term species canonis is altered from Junillus’s term species dictionis.

Another passage from the Instituta (II.xxviii, 526.15–18), on the things necessary to observe in order to understand Scripture, is quoted by Sedulius Scottus, Collectaneum Miscellaneum VIII.v.17 (CCCM 67, 31), and twice in the Collectio Canonum Hibernensis (see Canon Law Collections; ed. Flechner 2019 1:125 and 286; see also Sheehy 1987 p 280).

Finally, the lost Murbach manuscript that was the basis of Gast’s editio princeps included a prologue or accessus to the Instituta (ed. Gast 1545 sig. b1–4; two brief extracts are quoted by Kihn p 300). This prologue seems never to have been studied beyond Kihn’s brief comments, but it can be identified as Hiberno-Latin (see Wright, forthcoming), since it etymologizes Latin beatus as derived from a noun beo meaning uita, and simplex as from semis and plexus. This etymology of beatus is found in various Irish sources, including the Old-Irish Treatise on the Psalter and the Southampton Psalter (HIBERNO-LATIN, no. 13), apparently based on the Epitomae of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, whose fanciful word nebesium as part of a phrase meaning ‘life’ (ed. Lofstedt 2003 p 241, l. 57) was associated with Irish béo, ‘living’ (see Ó Néill 1979 pp 152–54; Poli 1984 pp 324–42; Herren 1984 p 207; for an alternative explanation relative to Virgilius Maro see Lambert 2009 p 228). The abbot of Lindisfarne Ædiluulf in his De Abbatiibus used the phrase pia castra beorum ‘blessed stronghold of the living’ (ed. Campbell 1967 p 47, l. 577), which Herren (1974 p 52 n 142) suggests is related to the Irish use of béo as an etymon for beatus (see now Breeze 2005 on this phrase as equivalent to Irish tir na mbéo ‘land of the living’). The etymology of simplex is closely related to the etymology semel and plexa found in various Insular (mainly Irish) grammatical treatises, including Tatwine, Ars Grammatica, and one of these, the Ars Ambrosiana (see
GRAMMARIANS) gives it as semel uel semis et amplector (ed. CCSL 133.52.12; on this rare etymology see Löfstedt 1972 p 59; Gallo 2020 pp 115–16).

Quotations or echoes of the Instituta have been identified in the Anglo-Latin writers Aldhelm, Bede, and Candidus Wizo.

Quots/Cits 1. Aldhelm in his De metris quotes Junillus’s comment about his system of placing the Greek letters Δ. before the questions and Μ. before the answers (the passage in Aldhelm is translated by Rosier and Lapidge p 195, who point out [p 266 n 16] that Aldhelm’s immediate source for the question-and-answer format of De metris is AUDAX, DE SCAURI ET PALLADII LIBRIS EXCERPTA. On Aldhelm’s use of Junillus (the manuscripts of De metris spell the name “Juniullus”) see also Dempsey (2015 pp 150–52 and 281–82). Unfortunately, Junillus’s system, which he claims to have employed in order to avoid confusion, has instead caused considerable confusion both for medieval scribes and for modern scholars. There is even disagreement as to what Junillus himself originally intended. In the great majority of manuscripts of the Instituta, and in Kihn’s critical text, Junillus says that Δ. (for Latin discipuli) indicates the students who ask the questions, while Μ. (for Latin magister) indicates the teacher who answers them. Aldhelm’s direct quotation from Junillus about these letters—which, as Bullough (1995 p 199 n 88) notes, is earlier than any surviving manuscript of the De instituta—follows this interpretation of the letters and assignment of the questions and answers. Ehwald (MGH AA 15, p 82 n 1) notes that Aldhelm’s example was followed by Bede and Alcuin, among others.

The Latin interpretation, however, directly inverts what the two Greek letters would be expected to mean in Greek: Δ. for διδάσκαλος, “teacher” and Μ. for μαθητής, “student.” One manuscript collated by Kihn does have Junillus interpret the letters this way in the prologue, and two others have Junillus say that the master asks the questions and the students answer them (and one of these also switches the letters throughout the text). Rahlfs (1891) and Traube (1911 pp 99–100) accordingly argued that the Greek interpretation and assignment of the questions to the teacher was the one intended by Junillus, but was misunderstood and misrepresented by scribes who assumed the Latin interpretation. Laistner (1947 pp 27–28) is non-committal, but notes some further passages in which certain manuscripts switch the letters. More recently O’Donnell (1979 pp 247–49) as well as Berschin (1988b pp 99–100) have endorsed this view of Junillus’s treatise as a kind of catechism. Bullough (1995 p 199), however, argues to the contrary that “there are no good grounds for supposing that the text here had been subject to corruption at an early date, and that the author’s original words had said just the opposite ...” Bullough notes other evidence for a shift in pedagogical method by the sixth century in favor of representing dialogues with students asking and masters answering. Archibald (2013 pp 198–97) shows that this shift is manifested in early medieval copies of and commentaries on DONATUS, ARS MINOR and in other dialogues compiled in the early Middle Ages, and that when these Greek letters are employed, their Latin interpretation is presupposed, and occasionally made explicit. There is, however, evidence for the survival of the Greek interpretation of the two letters (not specifically in relation to Junillus) in the SCHOLICA GRAECARUM GLOSSARUM (GLOSSARIES; see Archibald p 195), and Glaze (2007 pp 485–88) argues that it is impossible to be sure whether these symbols have their Greek or Latin meanings when used in the copy of the dialogue EPISTOLA PERI HERSEON (see under MEDICAL WRITINGS) in the English manuscript London, British Library Sloane 2839.
Western scribes (including the scribe of the Cotton Tiberius manuscript) regularly substituted for the standard form of the Greek letter Μ. the Syriac siglum จ. Berschin (1988a p 88) designates this “most curious of Greek letters” as “siglum-M”; Bischoff (1967 p 254 n 36) calls it “Western M.”

MSS. James (1931 pp 8–10) suggested that a manuscript of Junillus seen by John Leland at Malmesbury in the sixteenth century may have been the copy used by Aldhelm, though both James and Laistner (1947 p 27) considered the connection to Aldhelm unproven. James was unaware of the fragments of *Instituta regularia* I.ix–II.xvii and xxii–xxiv in the Cotton Tiberius manuscript (*CLA* 2.189). According to Thomson (2003 pp 103–5, revising Thomson 1981), who compares the script with the hands of *BONIFACE* and his associate (called by Parkes 1976 “Glossator A” and “Glossator B” respectively), the manuscript was produced in the southwest of England in the early eighth century. Thomson (2003 p 105) concludes that “there is good if not conclusive evidence that the Cotton Junilius is a fragment of the Malmesbury copy, and some reason to connect it with Aldhelm.” See also Lapidge (*ASL* p 34), who considers likely the identification of the fragments with the Malmesbury copy used by Alcuin.

Carley and Petitmengin (2004 pp 204–8) have added further support to this identification by showing that fols. 1–173 of the composite Tiberius A.xv manuscript, which contain a collection of Alcuin’s LETTERS, was almost certainly the manuscript used by William of Malmesbury and later examined by John Leland at Malmesbury (*Collectanea*, ed. Hearne 1770 2: 392–404). Carley and Petitmengin, following Flower (1935 p 52), believe that Leland took both the Junillus and Alcuin manuscripts from Malmesbury. According to Flower, Cotton Tiberius A.xv was later owned by Sir Laurence Nowell, who lent it to John Joscelyn. Carley and Petitmengin (p 207 n 55, citing Tite 2003 no. 49.10) show that it was Joscelyn who lent it to Sir Robert Cotton (who described the Junillus manuscript as ‘Fragmentum Theologicum literis antiquissimis et peregrinis’). According to Carley and Petitmengin (p 208):

> It seems highly unlikely that Cotton would have combined by chance two Malmesbury manuscripts, both admired by Leland and one at least almost certainly owned by him. Even though his marginalia are not found in the Junillus as it now survives, one can assume that he did acquire this manuscript and that it was he, not Cotton, who combined the two previously discrete units into one composite. If this is the case, Leland must have removed both when he visited Malmesbury in 1533 and bound them together as the composite which eventually passed to Cotton.

Carley and Petitmengin further note that the manuscript was already fragmentary before the Cotton Library fire of 1731, since Thomas Smith’s catalogue of 1696 describes it as “Fragmentum Theologicum, characteribus uetustis, et a festinante scriba exaratis” (ed. Tite 2003 p 21).

Carley and Petitmengin (pp 207–8 n 57) state the manuscript “now lacks a leaf from its pre-fire state,” which would have contained *Instituta*, II.xviii–xxii [beg.]. According to Carley and
Petitmengin, the correct order of the surviving leaves is 177, 179, 180, 176, 175, and 178, and their contents are as follows: fol. 177 = I.ix–xviii (beg.); fol. 179 = I.xviii (end)—II. ii; fol. 180 = II.ii–iv; fol. 176 = II.ii–iv; fol. 175 = II.xiii–xvii; fol. 178 = II.xx (end)–xxiv.

The surviving fragments of Tiberius A.xv do not overlap with Aldhelm’s quotation, but Thomson (2003 pp 103–4) compares his incorrect identification of Primasius as pope (“Primasio, sedis apostolicae pontifici,” ed. Ehwald, MGH AA 15, p 81, l. 18) with Leland’s entry “Junillus ad Primasium papam” (ed. Hearne 1770–4:157), which suggests that Aldhelm’s reading was derived from Tiberius A.xv. This manuscript was not used by Kihn; according to Thomson (2003 p 105), it is not related textually to Kihn’s manuscripts ADLEBHMPR.

Laistner (1947 p 29) speculated that Bede may have known of Junillus’s treatise, but that if so he would have disapproved of its exclusion of allegorical interpretation as well as of its biblical canon list. Since then, concrete evidence for Bede’s knowledge of the Instituta regularia has emerged. Although Charles W. Jones (1969–70 p 142 n 38) had echoed verbatim Laistner’s statement that “I have failed to find any trace of Junillus in Bede,” the apparatus fontium in Jones’s later edition of Bede’s DE NATURA RERUM (CCSL 121A) cites Junillus for three brief parallels. These are accepted by Lapidge (ASL p 219 no. 172) and by Kendall and Wallis (2010 pp 74–75) in the notes to their translation of Bede’s treatise, and subsequent research as summarized below has uncovered further evidence within the same chapter of Bede’s treatise.

Quots/Cits 2. The first of Jones’s parallels, however, is doubtful. Bede speaks of “God’s fourfold work” (“De quadrifario dei opere”), but Junillus speaks of four modes of “the power or working of the divinity” (“divinitatis efficientia sive operatio”), and the four things that Bede and Junillus go on to enumerate are completely different. Di Pilla (2012) p 30 considers this passage a synthesis of Augustinian doctrines about Creation.

Quots/Cits 3–5. Nonetheless, the parallels between Bede’s list of the works of the six days of Creation and that of Junillus do indicate that Bede was familiar with the Instituta. Jones cites verbal parallels in the phrasing for the second and third days, and Tinelli (2013 p 66) notes further parallels in the phrasing for the first day. Taken individually these might be dismissed as coincidental, since both summarize the same Biblical sequence, and since other lists of the works of the six days were in circulation. In addition, however, Pelle (2016 p 189) has shown that the sentence immediately preceding Bede’s list quotes Junillus directly and more distinctively, while Ahern (2020 pp 44–45) has plausibly suggested that Bede’s statement about God’s not resting from the “governance” of creation, but only from new creations, echoes another passage in Junillus.

Since these discrete findings have never been consolidated, it will be useful to quote the entire sequence in Bede together with the parallel passages from Junillus (verbal echoes are italicized). The passages from Bede are all sequential, as are the first two from Junillus (the third comes later in the same chapter):
Quots/Cits 3.

Bede:

In ipso quidem principio conditionis facta sunt caelum, terra, angeli, aer, et aqua de nihilo.

Junillus:

M In ipso quidem principio conditionis facta sunt caelum, terra, angeli, aer, et aqua.

Quots/Cits 4.

Bede:

Die uero prima lux facta est, et ipsa de nihilo. Secundo, firmamentum in medio aquarum. Tertio, species maris et terrae, cum eis quae terrae radicitus inherent. Quarto, luminaria caeli de lumine primo die facto. Quinto, natalitia et volatilia de aquis. Sexto, reliqua animalia de terra, et homo (carne quidem de terra, anima uero de nihilo, creatus); qui in paradiso, quem dominus a principio plantauerat, constituitur.

Junillus:

M In principio die prima lux facta est, secundo vero die firmamentum, tertia mare et terrae nascentia, quarta luminaria caeli, quinta natantia et volatilia, sexta reliqua animalia et homo.

Quots/Cits 5.

Bede:

Septimo dominus requieuit, non a creaturae gubernatione, cum in ipso uiuamus, et moueamur, et simus [Acts 17:28], sed a nouae substantiae creatione.

Junillus:

M Septima die requievisse dicitur deus non a creando, quippe cum cotidie ex eius dispensatione ac providentia omnis creatura renovetur aut constet, sed hoc significatum est, quod post illos sex dies nullam mundo incognitum substantiam speciem aut naturam novam inexpertamque creaverit.
The question of Bede’s sources for the Quots/Cits 5 about the seventh day is more complicated than Ahern (pp 44–45) represents it:

This passage, shorted and rearranged, gave Bede much of his vocabulary for the discussion in De natura rerum. He added a well-chosen scriptural quotation—Acts 17:28: “for in him we live, and move, and are”—to replace Junillus’s line about God’s dispensation. Gubernatio, meanwhile, was a term commonly used by Junillus throughout the work to describe God’s providence. We need, therefore, look no further for the source of this sentiment in Bede’s work.

Ahern is probably right to see Junillus as a source for this passage, especially in view of the further parallels in the immediately preceding passages in Bede. Yet Ahern is too quick to dismiss the possibility that Bede laid other sources under contribution at the same time. He rejects outright Kendall and Wallis’s suggestion (2010 p 137) that Bede’s discussion of God’s gubernatio may have been influenced by a passage in the Hiberno-Latin treatise by AUGUSTINUS HIBERNICUS, DE MIRABILIBUS SACRAE SCRIPTURAE (ed. PL 35.2151.60–69). Whether Bede himself had read this passage in the Irish pseudo-Augustine must remain doubtful, though ALCUIN’s comments on God as gubernator in his in GENESIM (Interrogationes Sigewulfi; ed. PL 100.517.26–34) appear to echo both Bede and the De mirabilibus (see Bracken 1998 §11 and nn. 20–21, and Fox 2003 pp 45–46 and n. 11, who states that De mirabilibus is “probably” Alcuin’s source). Yet Ahern himself acknowledges that God’s gubernatio is also a recurrent theme—indeed a dominant one—in AUGUSTINE’s DE GENESI AD LITTERAM, and Augustine regularly cites John 5:17 (“pater meus usque modo operatur et ego operor”) in this connection, as does Junillus (in the question that introduces the answer cited by Ahern). The juxtaposition of Gen 2:2 and John 5:17 was common (see O’Loughlin 1998 pp 274–95), but Siniscalco (1985 p 449 n 40) has shown that Bede’s juxtaposition of the two verses in his COMMENTARIUS IN GENESIM (ed. CCSL 118A.1080–86; cf. Brown and Biggs 2017–18 2:47) was drawn directly from the De Genesi ad litteram IV.xi (CSEL 28/1.107.10–17). Moreover, Junillus does not quote Acts 17:28, but Augustine does in the same chapter as part of his explanation of how God’s “resting” did not imply that he ceased from “working” through his divine gubernatio (109.9–10, 20–21). Bede’s passage should therefore be seen as a blend of Augustine and Junillus, as Di Pilla (2012: 31) suggests. Indeed, Junillus’s own comments on God’s gubernatio were probably based on Augustine; cf. Mathews (apud Maas 2003 p 19, though Maas does not actually refer to Augustine in his discussion of the theme of gubernatio in Junillus, pp 69–70).

Quots/Cits 6–8. Passages in three texts attributed to Alcuin’s pupil Candidus Wizo may have been influenced by Junillus, though none involves verbatim quotation.

Quots/Cits 6. Lockett (2011 pp 303–4) suggests that a passage in Candidus’s letter NUM CHRISTUS (ed. Dümmler, MGH Epist. 4) on the incorporeality and invisibility of God vis-à-vis that of the angels and of human souls reflects Junillus’s discussion of God’s complete lack of material form as opposed to the materiality ascribed to angels and human souls by virtue of being created. Christopher A. Jones (2017 p 298 n 68) suggests that the author of the pseudo-Augustinian EXCEP'T 1.1 (probably by Candidus) “perhaps intends the phrase mundus visibilis as equivalent to ‘the corporeal world’.” Lockett argues that Candidus’s definition of
incorporeality in relation to non-locality and non-circumscription in the same passage draws from not from Junillus but from GENNADIUS, DE ECCLESIASTICIS DOGMATIBUS.

Quots/Cits 7–8. Christopher A. Jones (2017) suggests that a passage in Junillus on the differences between rational and irrational creatures may have influenced two further passages that have been associated with Candidus. OMNIA TRIBUS CONSTAT (ed. Marenbon 1981) asserts that non-rational beings were created for the sake of Man, whereas Man and angels were created for the sake of God; Junillus states similarly that angels and men were created for their own sake, but non-rational beings were created for the sake of angels or men (see Jones 2017 p 288 n. 37). The similarity between Junillus and the obscure Excerpt 1.2 is more distant, and Jones suggests only that the “apparent topic—the instrumental and subordinate nature of irrational creatures to those that possess rational souls—may contain echoes” of the Instituta (p 287).

The fact that the quotations or echoes of Junillus in Bede and Candidus all come from the same (relatively lengthy) chapter II.ii on Creation may be a coincidence due to these English authors’ common interest in that capacious topic; but it may also indicate that this book circulated separately, perhaps as extracts within exegetical compilations (as in Ambrosiana F.60 sup.).

Charles D. Wright and Michael Boudreau
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