SOME NOTES ON ‘FIDES’ AND RELATED WORDS IN MEDIEVAL LATIN


I. INTRODUCTION

a) The description of word-groups 2

The scope of a lexicon does not allow the explicit comparison of various words having one origin or one basic meaning. Therefore we need separate studies, discussing such word-groups. The choice of the constituent parts of a word-group is highly subjective: the value of the study based on it will vary accordingly. Still, the discussion of the interrelations between the various words chosen, however few, can contribute to a more exact demarcation of their functions and meanings.

1. This study is based on the materials of the Dutch and French DuCange-committees and checked by that of the Lexique du Latin philosophique du Moyen Age. I wish to thank all those who kindly put their data at my disposal, especially Mrs. A.-M. Bautier, who spared no pains to facilitate my work. — The sigla of the sources quoted can be found in the Index scriptorum novus medius latinitatis (Hafniae 1972) and in the Index fontium of the Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandicae Medii Aevi (fasc. 1, Amsterdam 1970). — I left out juridical terms (fideissor etc.) because of their highly specialized application, as well as a number of words which seemed to provide no materially new or important concepts (e.g. fidenter, fidere, fidus, fidentia, confidere, diffidens, infidus, incredibilitis).

2. I have deliberately avoided the term 'semantic field' because this implicates a particular structuralist theory aiming at a certain degree of completeness for such a field, e.g. all colour terms, all military terms, etc.
b) ‘Fides’ as the center of a word-group

The choice of *fides* as the center of the word-group to be studied has been the result of the following considerations. In late Antiquity a the word had been given a fresh impulse by becoming the particular term for the Christian faith. This development was firmly established in the Christian Middle Ages, where *fides* universally figures as the one term for the one universal faith (cf. ch. io c).

Now this development may give rise to two hypotheses:

1. The enormous expansion of *fides* in the meaning of ‘Christian faith’ suggests a parallel extension of the range of uses to which the word may be applied, viz. its occurrence in combination with verbs, adjectives etc. This idea is obvious and will easily be proved by the lemmata of the various Medieval-Latin lexica.

2. The same universal extension of the mentioned authorized use of *fides* meaning ‘Christian faith’ may suggest another theory: it may have caused the gradual decline of the other meanings of the word. At a time when *fides* was primarily associated with Christian faith, the word probably grew less apt to designate quite different concepts.

The second hypothesis cannot be verified quantitatively, since no lexicon of Medieval Latin counts word-frequency under its aims, and with good reason. No conclusion can be drawn from the number of cards, and, accordingly, an empirical verification in the quantitative sense seems to be a possibility excluded. Still, it might be said that the hypothesis is *a priori* probable.

There is, however, a different way to check the same hypothesis empirically, viz. by showing how the non-Christian functions of *fides* gradually tended to be performed by other words. An example is provided by the word *fidelitas*, taking the specific function of feudal allegiance. For discussion of this development, see ch. io a.

---

3. By Antiquity I mean the period up to ca. AD 500, including Christian Antiquity.

4. Cf. e.g. the Dutch ‘geweer’, which originally meant ‘defence’, but came to mean ‘gun’ principally, to the effect that the first sense was taken over by ‘afweer’.
2. FIDES

Our medieval sources do not provide fully new meanings of fides, though there has been a shift in stress between two classical meanings (see ch. ro a) and a number of new expressions have been created. Accordingly, we can use Fraenkel’s Thesaurus article 5 for our basis, ever though Heinze’s criticism 6 is not unfounded. Heinze argues that fides indicates a relation with two directions: denoting the reliability of a person or thing, it implies at the same time the trust which the opposite party puts in it (cf. SUMMA Trec. p. 84, 10 fides autem est que ab uno promittitur et ab altero ita fieri speratur). The truth of this argument is experienced by anyone who tries to divide his quotations into two distinct groups: reliability and trust. Still, in writing a lemma for a lexicon, as Fraenkel did, it is necessary to make such distinctions. The following scheme is based on his article.

Survey of meanings

I. something which is trusted or relied upon
   A the thing itself which is trusted (guarantee, oath, confirmation)
   B the quality of people (and their deeds and words) in virtue of which trust is put in them (reliability, trustworthiness, fidelity)

II. trust or faith
   A in general
   B in a philosophic-theological sense
      a logical
      b metaphysical-theological
   C in the specifically Christian sense

5. Thesaurus Linguae Latinae VI, 1 col. 661-691.
Details

(Ad IA) The expression ‘fidel facere’ is regarded by Fraenkel as a very particular case, as the origin, in fact, of the meaning ‘belief’, ‘faith’. It is found in ancient rhetoric (cf. e.g. Rhet. ad Herennium I 6, 10 si oratio adversariorum fecerit fidel auditoribus). In such contexts the expression means ‘to establish faith among the public’. Whatever the value of Fraenkel’s theory that this is the origin, and of Heinze’s opinion of it, for Medieval Latin the question is not very complicated: fidel facere nearly always means ‘to take an oath’, ‘to guarantee’, e.g. CHART Trai. Brom 24, 1 p. 304, 7 [1424] dantes eodem mandatum... ordinandi, consenciendi et, si necesse fuerit, fidel faciendi. Compare also the expressions for ‘to guarantee (to swear fidelity) by means of an oath’: EINH. Carol. (ed. Halphen) p. 20 sacramento fidel facere; GREG. IV epist. p. 230, 14 memorem me esse debeere iuris-iurandi causa fidei facti imperatori; RADBERT. epitaph. arsen. AASS Ben. IV, 1 p. 512 mementote... quod mei vassali estis mihique cum iuramento fidel firmasti. There are, however, a few exceptions, in which the classical rhetorical meaning ‘to establish faith’ survives: it occurs, for instance, in medieval logic, where Cicero’s definition of argumentum, borrowed by Boethius, is reproduced by many others throughout the Middle Ages (cf. below pp. 81-2). Compare also the expression ‘fidel creditivam facere quod’ (‘to make plausible’, ‘to prove’): CHART. Breda 358, 17 p. 54, 8 [1420] dum nobis fidel fecerit creditivam quod continue residerit in studio generalis. The concept of ‘to establish faith’ is sometimes expressed by fides combined with a different verb: RAYM. POD. 8 p. 249 dumque his atque aliis ostentamentis fidel magnificae victorie nobis persuasissent.

(Ad IB) For ‘conjugal fidelity’ the usual word seems to be fides (and not fidelitas), cf. e.g. PHIL. LEYD. cur. 84, 8 Bona vero matrimonii principaliter tria sunt: fides, proles et sacramentum. In fide attenditur ne post vinculum coniugale cum alio vel alia coeatur. Accordingly, the expression for wedding-ring is anulus fidei.

8. See note 6.
(Ad IB) A special case of 'reliability' is provided by the expression 'fidei alicuius (or alicuius rei) committere' ('to entrust to') which constitutes a metaphorical development of the ancient juridical use. Cf. e.g. CHRON. s. Michael. Mos. p. 14 et cuuis fidei possent committi que sunt tacenda; CARTUL. s. Petri Trec. 18 p. 27 dignum est... transactiones et pacta... fidei committere litterarum.

(Ad IIA) The meaning 'faith', 'belief' in the general, non-Christian sense seems to occur in a number of more or less fixed expressions: fide habere, fide adhibere, fide dare, fide dignus. As far as fide habere is concerned, Fraenkel assumes ⁹ that in origin this expression did not mean 'fiduciam habere erga aliquem', but 'alicui fidelitatem attribuere'. In subsequent times, however, as Fraenkel says himself ¹⁰, this distinction was not experienced any more and often adhibere was used instead of habere. In our Medieval texts the notion of 'reliability' has disappeared from this expression and the only meaning which can be attributed to it is 'to give credence to', 'to put faith in'. This agrees with the fact that most quotations have a Christian context, which often makes it hardly possible to determine whether the meaning is general (non-Christian) or rather religious. Cf. e.g. BUSCH ref. 3,1 p. 675,22 si quis... firmam fidem a deo se exaudiri habuerit. A quite different meaning of fide habere is found in RICHER. hist. 4,59 p. 244,16 libellum fidelitatis ab Arnulfo quondam regibus de habenda fide porrectum, where it is equivalent to fide tenere or conservare. The expression fide dare can also mean 'to promise', at least in the phrase dextram et fide dare (GESTA Franc. Hierosol. 15 p. 76; PETR. TUDEB. hist. 6,4 p. 40.)

(Ad IIB) Definitions of fides are found in logic as well as in metaphysics. The source of its appearance in logic is the definition of argumentum as given by Cicero in his Topica and adopted by Boethius ¹¹: argumentum est ratio rei dubiae faciens fidei. This has been reproduced by countless philosophers in the course of the centuries. The late 15th century Dutch philosopher Gerard

---

¹⁰. Ibid. col. 686,40 and cf. col. 686,16-17.
¹¹. Cf. Cic. Top. 8; Boeth. In Cic. Top. 1, 1048B7-8 and De top. diff. 1174C7-8 and 1180C4-5.
of Harderwijk puts *fidem facere*, as contained in this definition, on a level with *probare*: *argumentum est ratio rei dubie faciens fidem, id est medium probans conclusionem*. It is clear, however, that the knowledge resulting from the *probatio* is knowledge of probability (*syllogismus dialeticus est qui ex probabilitibus facit credere; fides... effectus est syllogismi probabilis*), or, better, positive knowledge in contingent matters. The metaphysical-theological definition (*fides est substantia rerum sperandarum, argumentum non apparentium*, Vulg. Hebr. 11,1) implies the old concept that we cannot have knowledge about things which escape our perceptive faculties, but that we have to approach truth in these matters by means of an act of assent. The metaphysical description is used by Thierry of Chartres to explain one of the two kinds of faith which he distinguishes, viz. *fides virtus* as opposed to *fides credulitas*. For this distinction, which corresponds to the two kinds of definitions as discussed here, see ch. 10 c. The difference between the philosophic and theological sides of *fides* is noticed by Albertus Magnus in his *Summa theologica* (Ia t. 3 q. 15 c. 1): *Aliter accipitur fides et credulitas in philosophicis et in theologicis. In philosophicis enim, ut dicit Aristotes in III De Anima, opinio iuvata rationibus fit fides... in theologicis autem fides lumen est, certissimam faciens adhesionem et assensum.*

(Ad IIC) The division 'Christian faith' should be subdivided into two, more or less distinct, aspects: actual faith (*πίστις*) on the one hand and the expression of it on the other, viz., in its most general form, the collection of the articles of faith, dogmatics. Of course, these two meanings are narrowly interrelated. An expression like *fides Christi* should now be interpreted as 'the belief in Christ' (e.g. WILLIB. Bonif. 2,8, (II) *in fide et dilectione Jesu Christi*), now as 'the doctrine, the church of Christ' as opposed to paganism (e.g. VITA Liudg. 2,1, I p. 54,14 a *paganismo revocans Christi imbuit fide*; CHRON. Tiel. p. 12,15 *predicare fidem Christi et evangelium*). In early Christian times the first

12. GER. HARDERW. summ. 5 p. 263A45 sqq.
meaning (actual belief) was far more frequent \(^{15}\). Following the historical development of Christianity, however, the stress naturally has been transferred to the second. This varies from the whole Christian faith (as opposed to paganism) to a particular expression of it, *symbolum fidei* (e.g. GESTA abb. Fontan. p. 38 *fides Niceni concilii*).

3. **Fidelitas, fidelis, fideliter**

   a) *Fidelitas*

   For the hypothesis concerning the specific function of this word in the feudal system and the relation between its meanings ‘fidelity’ and ‘faith’, see \(^{1b}\) and \(^{10a}\).

   The discussion of *fidelitas* as found in the *Thesaurus* \(^{16}\), is quite disappointing. It opens with the misleading statement ‘i.q. *fides*’. Besides, its method differs from that of the *fides*-article (which first distinguishes ‘reliability’ and ‘faith’, subdividing the former into reliability of persons and of things) in putting these three groups on the same level. This is both incorrect and inconsistent \(^{17}\).

   **Survey of meanings**

   I : reliability, fidelity

   1 fidelity, loyalty, feudal allegiance
   2 the oath of allegiance
   3 concrete : followers, the faithful
   4 pledge, security

   II : Christian faith

   **Details**

   It is extremely difficult to distinguish sharply between I, 1 and I,2. Cf. e.g. CHART. Trai. 574 p. 41,5 [1206] ut... hominium

---


\(^{16}\) *Thes. L. L.* VI, 1 col. 661.

\(^{17}\) The lemmata *fidelis, fidelitas, fideliter* are not written by Fraenkel, but by G. Jachmann. The drawback of this working method is evident.
... omnes homines eos a fidelitate quam ei fecerant et hominio liberos et absolutos clamabit; BERCHEN chron. Gelr. 12 p. 9,27 imperator a Lothario filio suo sacramento fidelitatem exequi. In few quotations the meaning 'oath' cannot be doubted: SINN. expos. fo. 187 VB 18 et postea prestari debet fidelitas, id est iuramentum quod a vasallo prestatur domino.

(Ad I,4) The meaning 'pledge' is new, cf. RAYM. POD. 13 p. 265 suscepit dux obsides de castello pro fidelitate.

(Ad II) Probably the rare examples of fidelitas in the meaning of 'Christian faith' are due to the double function of the adjective fidelis (cf. ch. 3 b and 10 a).

b) Fidelis

This word is apt to denote the Christian believer as well as the vassal, in particular when used as a noun. Concerning the conjecture of a kind of distribution of tasks between fides and fidelitas (cf. ch. 1 b and 10 a), it may seem strange that the word fidelis should cover both fields. That this is, however, only the result of a natural development, will be shown in ch. 10 a.

In opposition to the historical sketch as given below (ch. 10 a), the lexicographic scheme might be presented as follows:

I adjective 1 faithful, loyal
2 faithful, religious

II noun 1 faithful follower: liegeman, vassal
2 faithful follower of Christ, Christian

c) Fideliter

The meanings of fideliter run parallel to the principal meanings of fidelis: it means 'in a reliable way' as well as 'according to faith'. It has one side, however, which is not represented by fidelis, viz. 'confidently', the non-Christian counterpart of the Christian 'according to faith' (usually expressed by fiducialiter or confidenter). Here the word seems to agree with the classical meaning of fides: 'confidence', 'trust' (fides IIA).
Survey

1 truly, loyally
2 a) confidently
   b) according to faith

Details

For a peculiarity within the first meaning, cf. ANSELM. LEOD. opusc. 1 p. 462,34 Dicit enim Augustinus: Quicumque sic credit ut loquitur, etsi vera non loquatur, tamen fideliter loquitur.

4. Fiducia, fiducialis, fiducialiter

a) Fiducia

On the one hand this word has preserved its classic meaning of ‘confidence’, ‘trust’, whereas it is certainly not confined to the non-Christian side of this concept. On the contrary, it is often used to denote the confidence in God (ad Deum, in Deo, in Deum). Its meaning may slightly differ from fides, in this respect, for which see ch. 10b.

On the other hand fiducia is used in the sense of fides or fidelitas, meaning ‘oath of fidelity or of allegiance’, in various expressions: fiduciam (-as) accipere, dare, facere. Cf. e.g. CARTUL. s. Magd. Castrodun. 23 p. 28 [II53] serviens vero et grangie trites michi fiduciam vel iusiurandum facient; CARTUL. Glannafol. 66 p. 410 [II25-29] illi homines faciant fiduciam; CARTUL. Maleolon. 10 p. 15 si infra terminos redierit, ubi fiducias de censu terminis convenientibus dare voluerit, terram habebit; CARTUL. s. Joh. in Vall. 33 p. 19 [II23] a cliente nostro fiduciam acciperet. This meaning is unprecedented in earlier times and should possibly be ascribed to the influence of fides, which originally denoted a relation with two directions (trustworthiness and trust, cf. ch. 2, IA and B) and always preserved these two aspects simultaneously. Accordingly, on the analogy of fides meaning ‘oath’ or ‘fidelity’ at the same time as ‘trust’ or ‘faith’, fiducia may have been given the new meaning ‘oath’, ‘fidelity’. A similar case is provided by the words credulus and credulitas (see ch. 6a and b) 18.

18. I do not think that the few examples of fidelitas in the meaning of ‘Christian faith’ can be ascribed to the same phenomenon (cf. ch. 3b).
Survey

1 trust, faith
   2 a) (oath of) fidelity, allegiance
       b) surety, guarantee
       c) protection

Details

A particular (rare) case of the ‘passive’ meaning (2) is ‘surety’, e.g. CARTUL. s. Mar. s. Anton. XVI p. 26 [1047-61] Albuinus abbatisse... quoddam ingerum venundavit vinea; estque Joscelinus de Melez fidutia pro supradicto Albuino.

Another remarkable aspect is the meaning of ‘protection’, for which in classical Latin fides would have been used: ANNAL. Mett. i p. 32 cernens autem Gripe quod minime potuisset evadere, in fiduciam fratrum suorum venit.

In accordance with the ‘passive’ meaning, the verb fiduciare is used to denote ‘to promise’, ‘to swear’; HIST. Ludov. 7,24 p. 175 ei fiduciavit quod communie deinceps non consentiret sed eam pentus dissiparet; CARTUL. s. Cyr. Nivern. iii p. 187 [1173] qualitercumque... et de quocumque voluerint firmare et firmitatem garentizare, pepigi et fiduciavi; LAMB. ARD. hist. Ghisn. 66 p. 593,37 eam tandem in uxorem sibi fiduciavit et spopondit.

b) Fiducialis

This adjective does not call for any specific remarks.

c) Fiducialiter

Here again the Thesaurus-article 19 seems insufficient: fiducialiter is translated with licenter, confidenter, fideliter. These three terms refer to two different concepts: licenter and confidenter mean ‘self-confidently’, ‘frankly’, whereas fideliter, as appears from the quotations, must mean here ‘full of confidence, trust’. Quotations, illustrating the two meanings, are given intermixedly, indeed.

19. Thes. L. L. VI,x col. 702, 7-68.
In the Medieval texts the meaning ‘full of trust’ is predominant and, as *fiducia*, is often applied to Christian contexts.

**Survey**

1. full of trust
2. self-confidently, frankly
3. safely

**Details**

The third meaning, ‘safely’, which already occurs in early Christian times, seems to agree with the ‘passive’ side of *fiducia* (see 4a). E.g. GESTA Franc. Hierosol. 3 p. 16 *cum putarent exire fiducialiter quo vellent*.

---

5. **CONFIDENTIA, CONFIDENTER, CONFIDERE**

   **a) Confidentia**

   As *fiducia, confidentia* has retained its meaning ‘confidence’, ‘trust’, which is applied without restrictions to the trust in God (*ad Deum, in Deum, in Deo*). It also retained its classic meaning ‘self-confidence’ or ‘audacity’.

   **b) Confidenter**

   Firstly, the word preserved the classic meaning of ‘confidently’, ‘with assurance’, ‘audaciously’.

   Secondly, it serves as the adverb expressing the meaning of ‘to trust’, which is also expressed by *confidentia* and *confidere*. E.g. GROTE paup. p. 436,5 *divine voluntati... peticiones eorum humiles confidenter committentes*.

   Thirdly, it sometimes seems to mean ‘so as to establish confidence’: ACTA Henr. II 488 t. II p. 39 *promisit autem confidenter quod de eodem daturus est mihi fideissores*. Compare the third meaning of *fiducialiter*, which, however, is not wholly similar: *fiducialiter* means ‘in a way which gives rise to one own’s confidence’, whereas *confidenter* means ‘so as to provoke an other person’s confidence’. 
c) Confidere

In accordance with confidentia, the verb confidere (meaning 'to put confidence in') is applied to the Christian atmosphere. It is also found as 'to entrust to' (= credere, committere): VITA Joh. Brinck. fo. 33 V p. 337,5 venit aliquando femina quedam ad eum confidens ei bursam plenam pecuniis.

6. CREDULITAS, CREDULUS, CREDERE

a) Credulitas

On the one hand credulitas preserved both its older meaning 'credulity' and the more recent meaning 'faith', 'persuasion' (in the general as well as the Christian sense). On the other hand the word occurs in the 'passive' meaning, viz. 'trustworthiness', 'credibility'. Cf. ACTA duc. Norm. 115 p. 278[1048] data insuper credulitatis gratia mea fide; LAMB. MONT. phys. 4 i° 77VB5 ad credulitatem huius opinionis multum proficit quod...

Survey:

1 credulity
2 faith, persuasion (general and Christian)
3 a) trustworthiness, credibility
   b) protection (= fides)
   c) credit (= credentia)

Details

As the extension which fiducia underwent on account of the new 'passive' meaning shows ample differentiation, so the 'passive' side of credulitas is not confined to the more general meaning of 'reliability'. As fiducia, it seems to have been used to denote 'protection': CARTUL. Ruscinon. priv. p. 48 de toto hoc predicto accipio illos in meam credulitatem et ero illis... manutenens et adiutor (in classical Latin accipere in fiden).

Secondly, credulitas seems to occur in the sense of credentia, 'credit': CARTUL. Antr. r7 p. 147 vendas scilicet que de macellariorum officio exuent et ab eisdem macellariis credulitatem in carne emenda per quadraginta dies. Compare credere I, r.
b) *Credulus*

The word runs parallel to the noun. The old meaning ‘credulous’ survived. The commonest medieval meaning is ‘having faith’, which mostly stands without a complement, but sometimes takes a dative case: ‘having faith in’, ‘believing’, e.g. HUGO Lid. 7 p. 285B25 ego demando sibi, quatenus de cetero credulus sit donis omnipotentis filii dei. In this sense credulus is also used as a noun denoting the faithful Christian.

On the other hand, still agreeing with credulitas, the word occurs in the passive sense of ‘trustworthy’, ‘reliable’, cf. e.g. ERMOLD. NIGEL. Ludow. 348 (MGH Poet. II p. r6) portarum custos credulus atque sagax. Probably, the unexpected appearance of a passive side, both of credulus and of credulitas, may be compared to the similar phenomenon as found for fiducia (see ch. 4a) and may be explained in the same way.

Survey:

1. credulous
2. having faith (general and Christian)
3. trustworthy, reliable.

\*c) Credere*  

Just as fides was the particular term to denote Christian faith, so credere was the verb expressing the action of believing, i.e. adhering to Christian dogma. Being a technical term, the word was enriched (as fides was) by a number of technical expressions, e.g. credere Deo, credere Deum and credere in Deum, all three expressing a different kind of faith.

In contrast to the development of fides (cf. ch. 1b and 1oa), there seems to be no reason to suppose that credere lost any of its original functions. Firstly, the verb shows the entire range of classic meanings, augmented with some new expressions based on them. Secondly, there is no other verb which has taken over one or other specific function.

---

20. Under credulus the *Thes. L. L.* (IV 1151-53) mentions two places which are described as ‘passive, i. quod facile creditur’.

Survey

I generally

1 to entrust to, to give credit
2 to believe, to attach faith to
3 to believe, to think

II of Christian faith: to have faith, to believe

Details

The general meaning of ‘to believe’, ‘to attach faith to’ (I, 2) provides a number of new expressions, e.g. leviter credens, ‘credulous’ (cf. German ‘leichtgläubig’), cf. HENR. ARNHEM. ort. 10,74 erat enim homo simplex, leviter credens (cf. GUILL. TYR. hist. res. transm. XIII, 11 p. 570 qui simplex et nimium credulus verbis illius fidem habens).

A particular expression resorting under II is credentes, which is synonymous to creduli (cf. ch. 10c).

The expression of ‘credere ad’, as found in the Thesaurus 22, is probably due to a misinterpretation of a number of passages, which are all founded on one sentence occurring in the Vulgata: Gen. 15, 6 Eduxit eum foras et ait illi: suspice caelum et numer a stellas si potes. Et dixit ei: sic erit semen tuum. Credidit Abram Deo et reputatum est illi ad iustitiam (‘he counted it to him for righteousness’). This may be the source of Ambrosius, Paulinus of Nola and Augustinus as quoted in the Thesaurus, though it is remarkable that in all three quotations credere is combined with corde. The expressions of ‘fidem habere ad’ and ‘fiducia ad Deum’, though seeming to provide parallels, provide no sufficient reason to accept the alleged ‘credere ad’, which in all three cases is followed by iustitiam! The quotations from Hieronymus (vir. ill. 5 cum ad praedicationem eius Sergius credidisset) and c. Vigil. 6 (ad suum evangelium crediderunt), given in the same passage of the Thesaurus, are out of place, because they illustrate a quite different meaning of ad, viz. ‘after hearing...’, ‘following...’, which already occurs in Antiquity. Finally, the last passage quoted there betrays a more serious error: (Gregorius, moral. 1,25) quod

ad vitam credentes populos non sermo sed causa suaderet. It is clear that here ad is to be connected with suaderet and credentes with populos.

7. INFIDELITAS, INFIDELIS

a) Infidelis

The development of this word in early Christian times up to ca. A.D. 600 has been discussed by H. Schmeck in *Vigiliae Christianae* 5 (1951). The scheme of meanings he gives in his summary is the following:

I objective, external reference (non Christianus)
   a) Iudaicus – Iudaeus
   b) ἔθνος, gentilis, paganus
   c) haereticus

II internal reference (non credens)
   a) in the absolute sense
   b) of little faith (kleingläubig)

III moral reference (peccator, impius, malus)

Of this scheme I and II may stand for Medieval usage as well. Schmeck rightly remarks that meaning I was far more important than meaning II, for which incredulus was more appropriate (cf. ch. 10). Meaning III is more questionable: many instances mentioned by Schmeck may simply be classified under IIa. They may very well imply, of course, sin and baseness, but they do not have such a meaning of their own right. Indeed, the combination with words like impius, malus, peccator, etc., proves this. Other quotations seem to show a moral meaning, which should rather be connected with the old, but still existing, 'passive' meaning of 'unfaithful', 'unreliable', e.g. Salvin. eccl. 3,30 testator infidelissimus; CONSUELT. Norm., I, LXV, 3 p. 57 iussit placitatores ita in iuste iudicantes poni in prisionem regis, donec redderent ei ultimum catallorum suorum quadrans et amod inter vicinos suos infideles haberentur.
b) Infidelitas

This word resembles infidelis in its principal function of referring objectively to paganism. It also occurs in the ‘internal’ sense of ‘disbelief’ or ‘incredulity’ (cf. infidelis II and ch. 10a). Finally, it has retained its classical meaning of ‘infidelity’, ‘unreliability’.

Survey:

1. infidelity
2. a) paganis
   b) heresy
3. disbelief

Details:

Meanings 2a and b could be illustrated by a clear example: HENR. GORICH. compend. II, II, 2, 3 fo. 90RB4 unde a rectitudine fedei (sic) dupliciter contingit deviare; uno modo quia ipsi Christo non vult assentire et talis habet quasi malam voluntatem circa ipsum finem, et hanc speciem infidelitatis habent pagani et Iudei... Sic heresis est species infidelitatis pertinens ad eos qui Christi fidem confitentur sed eius dogmata corrumpunt.

8. IncrEDULITAS, INCREDULUS

a) Incredulitas

As credulitas is the usual noun for the act or state of believing, so incredulitas denotes non-believing: PETR. LOMB sent. II, 335, 3 p. 495 non credere enim in Christum incredulitatem dicunt et nomine incredulitatis malum mentis actum significari. However, it can also have the meanings of paganism and heresy, more usually expressed by infidelitas.

b) Incredulus

This word seems to occur less often than infidelis. (For its development in early Christian times cf. Schmeck loc. cit. note 13). It can have all meanings mentioned under infidelis I and II,
but for *incredulus* the second meaning (internal reference) is clearly preponderant.

Besides, *incredulus* seems to have been used in the sense of *incredibilis*: GESTA Franc. Hierosol. 22 p. 124 *dic mihi omnia que in corde meo sunt incredula*.

Probably on the analogy of *incredulus* and *incredulitas*, the verb *incredere* was formed to express the opposite of believing: VITA Martin. Turon. XXI, 23 p. 31 *Quid te cunctantem... incredere cerno? ipse vides, ego sum Christus cunctis venerandus*.

9. **Perfidia, perfidus**

In ALMA 22 (1952) B. Blumenkranz published a study on *perfidia* and *perfidus*. In his conclusion he rightly remarks that in religious contexts the words nearly always show a religious sense: 'incredulity' and 'incredulous'. He continues by saying that this sense contains many aspects ('incroyance persécutrice', 'rupture de foi', 'fausse croyance', 'refus de croire', 'manque de confiance') — *perfidia* and *perfidus*, indeed, denote all kinds of incredulity, the 'internal' disbelief, paganism and heresy—and that he has not been able to discern any evolution within the range of these meanings nor even any ascendency of one meaning over the others, except, perhaps, for the general meaning of incredulity.

Now one obscurity remains. In Antiquity the words *perfidia* and *perfidus* only had what Blumenkranz calls the 'moral' meaning of 'faithlessness', 'dishonesty', 'treachery', 'perfidy', which, incidentally, they retained throughout the Middle Ages. How did they come to denote the rather different concept of disbelief? Probably, it was analogy which caused the development. *Infidelis*, meaning 'unfaithful', 'unreliable' in Antiquity, became the usual word to denote 'non-Christian', 'disbelieving', as a result of the same metaphor which made *fidelis* mean 'christian', 'believing' (cf. ch. 10a). Accordingly, as *perfidia* and *perfidus* originally showed a similar meaning, it is quite natural that they should also have followed the later development of *infidelis* and *infidelitas*. 
10. INTERRELATIONS AND OPPOSITIONS

a) Fides – fidelitas
(with fidelis as their common adjective)

In Antiquity the more original meaning of fides, 'guarantee', 'reliability', was also much more important than the meaning 'trust', 'faith' 23. In the Middle Ages the opposite is true. Because of the expansion of Christianity, the meaning 'faith' conquered an immense field, whereas 'reliability' declined somewhat. A particular case is provided by the concept of 'fidelity' as the essential element of the feudal system. In the sources dating from the centuries before ca. AD 1000, this concept seems to be expressed by fides as well as, and even more so than, by fidelitas. Later on, however, and especially after ca. 1200, it is fidelitas which is used as the technical term for this function. Of course, fides is never fully deprived of this meaning — such developments are not likely to take on absolute dimensions —, but the usual term in the feudal context is fidelitas. This word was very apt for the function attributed to it, because, as appears from the quotations in the Thesaurus article 24, until Hieronymus fidelitas has no other meaning than 'fidelity', 'reliability' or 'oath', it never means 'belief' or 'faith' in the general sense, and it provides only very few instances of the meaning 'Christian faith' (cf. ch. 3a). Accordingly, in the Middle Ages fidelitas gradually developed into the technical term for the feudal fidelity, taking over this particular function from fides and, in turn, leaving its other meanings — fidelity in general, conjugal fidelity — to be expressed by fides.

Recapitulating one could say that fides, being the technical term for Christian faith, tended to loose its aptitude for performing a second particular function, viz. that of the feudal fidelity or oath, which was taken over by fidelitas; and that fidelitas, becoming the technical term for feudal fidelity, was inclined to leave the more general cases of fidelity or oath to fides. Both tendencies grow clearer as the Middle Ages progress, and neither

23. This appears from the Thes. L. L. VI col. 663 ff.
24. Thes. L. L. VI,1 col. 661, 8-33.
of them ever reached exhaustiveness. Still, they are too obvious to be overlooked.

This distinction between *fides*, which in the later Middle Ages performs the functions of faith and of reliability in general, and *fidelitas* having that of feudal fidelity, is paralleled by the (also later Medieval) opposition between the expressions *fidem facere* and *fidelitatem facere*. The former, *fidem facere*, means ‘to guarantee’, ‘to promise’, usually in the general sense, whereas *fidelitatem facere* usually occurs in a feudal context, meaning ‘to swear allegiance’, ‘to have a relationship of allegiance’.

So far, our data seem to justify the hypothesis (mentioned in ch. 1b) that the non-Christian functions of *fides* tended to decline under the overwhelming influence of its meaning ‘Christian faith’, and that, therefore, other words came to take over some of its other specific functions.

Now this theory seems to be weakened by the fact that *fidelis* is used, especially as a noun, in connection with Christian faith (‘faithful’, ‘religious’) as well as with the feudal system (‘faithful’, ‘loyal’). This problem, however, can be solved: in origin *fidelis* was an adjective meaning ‘faithful’, ‘loyal’. In accordance with the normal pattern it came to be used as a noun meaning ‘the faithful or loyal man’ and, in a social context, could designate the followers or vassals of some lord. Now, by a common metaphor, the faithful Christians were the followers (or even vassals) of Christ. *Christi fideles* (or *Christifideles*) was such a normal expression that *fideles* came to mean ‘the faithful’, ‘the Christians’ of its own right, and the last stage was the use of *fidelis* as an adjective in the sense of ‘religious’, ‘Christian’. In scheme: faithful = loyal → the loyal men or vassals → the faithful = the Christians → faithful, religious, Christian. Accordingly, as contrasted to *fides*, the Christian meaning of which developed from the general meaning of ‘faith’, ‘belief’, one may suppose that the Christian meaning of *fidelis* developed from the non-Christian meaning of ‘the loyals’, ‘the followers’ by way of a metaphor. On the one hand, the etymological connection with *fides* may have contributed to this development (if *fides* — ‘belief’ is common, then why not *fidelis* — ‘believing’?) On the other hand, the metaphor itself, which, of course, never died out completely,
facilitated the simultaneous existence of the two basic meanings of fidelis 25.

b) Fides — fiducia — confidentia

Between these three terms a primary and a secondary opposition can be established. Firstly, fiducia and confidentia may be taken together and opposed to fides. Secondly, fiducia and confidentia may be opposed to each other.

All three terms are applied to Christian faith, but within that immense field they do not occupy exactly the same territory. Fides, in its 'active' sense, is probably based on, and in any case largely influenced by, its application in the field of ancient rhetoric (see p. 80). It denotes 'belief' rather than 'trust': a rhetor is not trusted, but believed. Within the Christian context one could say that fides designates the belief in God (in His existence, in His words and deeds), whereas fiducia and confidentia mean trust or confidence in God (in His presence and assistance). It is clear that these two concepts are narrowly interrelated and generally imply each other. It remains, however, possible to distinguish between them, and the difference may be

25. Cette étude était entièrement rédigée et prête à être publiée lorsqu’a paru l’ouvrage de Mme Élisabeth MAGNOU-NORTIER, Foi et Fidélité, Recherches sur l’évolution des liens personnels chez les Francs au VIIe au IXe siècle (« Publications de l’Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail », Série A, tome 28), Toulouse, s.d. [1976], 134 pp. Ce livre traite des rapports entre fides et fidelitas dans une aire et une période relativement restreintes: son point de vue est aussi très particulier. La conclusion de Mme M.-N. est que, dans le domaine qu’elle a étudié, fides a cédé la place à fidelitas pour des raisons qui tiennent plus à l’évolution des liens personnels chez les Francs qu’à la valeur sémantique générale de ces deux mots: ce sont les institutions qui ont changé plus que l’usage des mots. Mme M.-N. étudie donc un phénomène très limité par rapport à l’article de Mlle Weijers et son travail ne donne pas lieu à modifier quoi que ce soit au texte de ce dernier. Néanmoins il n’est pas indifférent de constater que l’évolution décelée par Mme M.-N. va dans le même sens que celle qu’expose Mlle W., dont l’explication justifie peut-être, non pas certes l’évolution des institutions franques, mais l’application d’un certain vocabulaire à ces institutions. Il est plus curieux de constater d’autre part que l’évolution du mot fides dans la latinité médiévale ne trouve pas son équivalent dans l’usage de l’ancien français: le mot « foi » s’emploie le plus souvent pour désigner les rapports sociaux (fidélité au serment, sincérité) et fort peu l’adhésion à la religion chrétienne, pour laquelle il cède volontiers la place à « créance » et à « loi ». (N. de l’E.)
supported by the fact that the concept of ‘Christian doctrine’ (viz. the contents of Christian faith, the collection of articles that are and should be believed) is expressed by fides, but never by fiducia or confidentia. This means that fides can have an objective application, whereas fiducia and confidentia only allow of a subjective one.

As far as Christian faith is concerned, it seems impossible to distinguish between fiducia and confidentia. In non-Christian contexts, however, there seems to be a difference: Servius (in Aen. 1, 132) states that fiducia is a person’s confidence in (morally) good matters, confidentia in bad matters (which was, in fact, a normal distinction in classical Latin): et hoc loco fiduciam pro confidentia posuit, cum fiducia in bonis rebus sit, confidentia in malis. This statement has been reproduced throughout the Middle Ages, cf. e.g. CONFL. VOC. confidentia, trouwe... dicitur confidentis proprietas et accipitur sepe in malis, ut elici potest in dictis, ut dicendo: ‘Iste loquitur cum confidentia’, id est audacia vel presumptione... et licet fiducia dicitur in malis, tamen non semper. Now confidentia certainly occurs ‘in bonis’ (think only of its aptitude for the Christian use) and fiducia seems to occur ‘in malis’ according to the CONFL. VOC. This makes clear that the distinction has become artificial.

In this connection an example may be quoted of fidentia showing its classical meaning (which seems to have remained the only one throughout the Middle Ages), ‘self-confidence in good matters’: HRABAN. Univ. 15, 1 PL 111, 417 C-D fidentia est per quam magnis et honestis in rebus multum animus in se fiduciae certa cum spe collocavit.

The adjectives fiducialis and confidens do not show any peculiarity. As far as the adverbs are concerned, fiducialiter occurs (and occurred already in early Christian times) in the meaning of ‘self-confidently’, usually expressed by confidenter, whereas one of the meanings of confidenter is ‘trustfully’. Accordingly, the distinction as described for the nouns does not apply to the adverbs. As a matter of fact, the two adverbs are very similar: both have the meanings ‘trustfully’, both mean ‘self-confidently’

---

and both also show a kind of 'passive' meaning, though not exactly equal (see ch. 5b). This may illustrate the artificiality of the medieval distinction applied to the nouns.

c) Fides – credulitas and fidelis – credulus

In the description of the opposition between fides on the one hand and fiducia and confidentia on the other, the conclusion was that fides can have an objective application, whereas the other two do not show that faculty. In the same way one may contrast fides to credulitas and state that credulitas designates the subjective quality of 'believing', 'the action or state of believing'. In fact, it is used as the noun belonging to credere, cf. e.g. AMALAR. epist. p. 242, 22 de credulitate, quomodo credendum sit in Deum. When used in its own right, credulitas sometimes can replace fides, it seems: cf. ORDO ROM. 21, 119 t. III p. 508 credulitas catholica, instead of the common fides catholica (compare, however, CARTUL. Remens. p. 223 [1067] credulitatem suam aperuit et ut vere catholicus confessionem suam fecit, where credulitas again denotes the actual and personal faith). At the same time it is understood that fides has both the subjective and the objective potentiality 27. When occurring, however, within one and the same context, fides and credulitas seem to show a clear-cut distinction in the sense already mentioned: credulitas denotes the personal act or state of believing and fides the substance of the Christian faith, its doctrine or its articles. Cf. HUGO S. VICT. sacram. et inventur in credulitate fidei substantia; LAMB. MONT. salv. p. 9B18 patet quod credere ista duo, sc. unum esse deum et remuneratorem inquirentibus se, suffecit gentibus ad salutem, quia in tali credulitate includitur fides incarnationis et redemptionis facta per Christum; DUDO Norm. 121 p. 283 evangelizare vobis nostre credulitatis gestio fidem; VITA Amant. Engol. 9 p. 341,3 neque poterat sustinere promissa si deesset fidei

27. They are distinguished by Richard de Mediavilla (sent. III d.25, a 5 q. 2 cond., Brixiae 1591 III p. 281a) who even discerns three aspects: Fides accipi potest vel pro his que creduntur vel pro habitu quo creduntur vel pro actu credendi. Cf. also Henry of Ghent, Summa a. 6 q. 2 ad 3 Po. 442 in fide tria considerantur, scilicet habitus fidei et modus sciendi sive cognoscendi per fidem et ipsum creditum sive obiecutum fidei.
credulitas firma. An interesting example is provided by Thierry of Chartres (lect. Boet. Trin. prol. i p. 125) unde munit auctor fidem nostram, id est credulitatem, contra impugnatores catholicae fidei, where the first fides is used in the sense of, and, accordingly, is explained by credulitas 28.

One might object that the word credibilia means ‘doctrinal points’, which concept is rather similar to ‘articles of faith’ and, therefore, should be expected to be expressed by some word related to fides. This objection can be refuted, however, by arguing that credibilia designates the doctrinal points in as far as they require the act of believing and cannot be reasoned out by the intellect: MARSIL. ING. sent. 3, 15, 3 fo. 467 VB 35 fides intellectum qui solis naturalibus insistendo multis erroribus se involveret et ad suprema credibilia scandere non posset, perficit (cf. also BLOMEV. cand. evang. cand. 2 dist. 2, 101, 230 unde ponitur in intellectu virtus fidei que est de credendis que humano non prosopiciuntur intellectu nec ratione indagantur).

This is the most common and obvious contrast between fides and credulitas. There are, however, two other possibilities. Fides taken in its subjective sense and, as such, contrasted to credulitas (= the act of believing), seems to represent the aspect of ‘adhering to the Christian faith’, ‘being faithful to religion’, for which the old metaphor of fideles — ‘followers of Christ’ may be responsible. For this distinction, see below pp. 100-1 (fideles – credulus).

Finally, fides and credulitas may be contrasted as is done by Thierry of Chartres and later philosophers and theologians: as fides virtus opposed to fides credulitas. This opposition corresponds in a way to the two kinds of definitions of fides as discussed above (ch. 2), viz. the metaphysical – theological and the logical definition: fides virtus is, in fact, illustrated by Thierry of Chartres with the metaphysical definition. Cf. THEOD. CARNOT. lect. Boet. Trin. prol. 2 p. 125 fides enim duobus modis dicitur: fides virtus secundum hoc quod dicitur ‘fides est substantia rerum

28. Of course credulitas is often used in definitions of the subjective side of fides, e.g. Isid. diff. 1,486 (P.L. 83,58) fides est credulitas qua Deum confitemur; Petr. Hisp. de anima tr. 10 c. 10 fides vero est opiniones vehemens aut presumptiosa credulitas.
sperandarum, argumentum non apparentium', fides credulitas qua credimus quod persone Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sunt unius substantie, sunt una divinitas; GER. HARDERW. summ. 5 p. 264A34 'fides' accipitur dupliciter: uno modo pro habitu quo assentimus his quae sunt supra naturam ex sola auctoritate revelantis... (quotes Vulg. Hebr. 11, 1); et sic non facit aliquid argumentum fیدem. Accordingly, one could say that fides virtus (or fides as opposed to credulitas) designates the act of assent to things which cannot be reasoned out. On the other hand, fides credulitas (or credulitas as opposed to fides) means persuasion established by arguments, and thus corresponds to the logical definition of fides: DOM. GUNDISS. div. phil. p. 81 et quod inducit nos ad sciencias credulitatis vocatur argumentatio; THEOD. CARNOT. lect. Boet. Trin. I, r8 p. r37 Ultra vero opinionem est credulitas quia qui opinione habet, habet et dubitationem. Sed qui credit, non dubitat. Nam si dubitat, non credit. Et ita credulitas est quasi medium intra opinionem et scientiam: infra scientiam et ultra vel supra opinionem; GER. HARDERW. summ. 5 p. 264A39 alio modo (cf. above uno modo) accipitur 'fides' pro quocumque assensu vel credulitate et sic non distinguuntur contra opinionem. Et hoc modo actus eius est etiam credere, licet non eodem modo... quod syllogismus dialeticus est qui ex probabilibus facit credere. Cf. also Albertus Magnus de anima p. r74, 23 fides et credulitas 30 effectus est syllogismi probabilis. Amplius, si omnem opinionem consequitur fides... sic autem fides sequitur persuasum esse. Now fides, as is shown in the discussion above (ch. 2) and explicitly stated by Thierry of Chartres (lect. Boet. Trin. I, 2. p. r31 fides enim equivocum est ad fidem virtutem et ad credulitatem) has both meanings. Credulitas, however, serves to define one particular aspect of fides, viz. the second meaning as described here (persuasion established by arguments) and, accordingly, may be said to be contrasted to other meanings of fides, in particular to what is called by Thierry fides virtus.

As far as fidelis and credulus are concerned, we may learn from Schmeck (see ch. 7a) that credulus occurs in the Bible only once

29. The last concept also occurs in Alanus de Insulis and Hugo of St-Victor.
30. Albertus designates with fides et credulitas the same concept as Thierry's fides credulitas.
or twice, which is natural because *credere*, which had become a specifically Christian word, could provide participles and paraphrasing expressions, whereas *fidere* could not do anything similar, with the result that *fidelis* came into common use. So far Schmeck and patristic Latin. In Medieval Latin the use of *credulus* has been largely extended. Leaving a discussion of their relative frequency to others (probably in the far future), one might compare the two words with regard to their semantic side. In that respect *fidelis* might be called a religious-sociologic term (‘adhering to Christian faith’) and *credulus* a religious-psychologic term, denoting a mental state (‘believing’, in the Christian sense). This agrees with the development of *fidelis* as described in ch. 10a: ‘the faithful or loyal men’ taken in the sense of Christ’s followers (*Christifideles*) and, accordingly, obtaining the function of the ‘Christians’. *Fidelis* thus preserves an element of ‘fidelity’, whereas *credulus* simply figures as the adjective for *credere*. Cf. ADAM. PERSEN. epist. 5,60 p. 124 incorporatus Christo credulus efficitur et fidelis, credulus ad fiduciam promissorum, fidelis ad custodiam mandatorum.

Besides *fideles*, both *creduli* and *credentes* occur in the meaning of ‘the Christians’, but (as far as can be seen) rarely. This cannot be contrary to expectation, because in the concept of ‘the Christians’ it is the element of adhering to the one and only Church that counts, not the personal degree or kind of believing.

d) *Infidelis – incredulus – perfidus*

As far as the early development of *infidelis* and *incredulus* are concerned, Schmeck remarks that *infidelis* was more closely connected with religion because of its being directly related to *fides*, and that the great development of *infidelis* was due to its Greek example ἄσιστος. Though patristics must remain outside the scope of this article, it might be profitable to say that in discussing the development of a negative concept, it seems inevitable to draw the positive counterpart into the discussion. It might very well be *fidelis* which caused the sudden extension of *infidelis*. Schmeck next discusses the relation of *infidelis* and *incredulus* as found in the *Vetus Latina*, and (on p. 136) arrives at the semantic opposition of the two words: *infidelis* is mainly used of pagans, whereas
inchédulus from the beginning designates the internal disposition and is often applied to people who are lacking in faith. This conclusion may hold good for Medieval usage, too, though there is no sharp distinction: both words can have the external as well as the internal sense, but the stress remains different. As a matter of fact, this difference cannot seem unnatural or unexpected, because it fully agrees with the opposition between fídelis and crédule (see ch. 10c).

Perfidus probably agrees with infídelis, rather than with incredule on account of its parallel development (cf. ch. 9). It should be noted, however, that it can have all meanings mentioned under infídelis (ch. 7a), including that of internal disbelief: cf. ORD. VIT. hist. I, 12, t. I p. 49 cui venenosus serpens opponitur, quo perfidia vel incredulitas figuratur.
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