

Hiltalinger's Augustinian Quotations

The biography of Johannes Hiltalinger de Basilea, O. E. S. A., was written half a century ago by Hermann Haupt with such competency that little need be added. In spite of the fact that this biography has been published in two great German Encyclopediae ¹⁾, Hiltalinger to this day remains practically unknown.

Johannes Hiltalinger became Lector at Avignon in 1357, taught as such at the *Studium Generale* in Strassburg, and within a short period gained so great a reputation for learnedness that Jordan of Saxony, O. E. S. A., dedicated to him his *Vitasfratrum* ²⁾. He read ³⁾ as Baccalarius Parisiensis ca. 1365-66 while Simon de Cremona ⁴⁾ was probably 'Baccalarius Secundarius Augustiniensium'.

As Baccalarius Formatus Hiltalinger held his *Decem Responsiones* (10 RR): RR 1-5 in Paris before 1368; R 6 in Toulouse

¹⁾ cf. *Realencyklopädie f. prot. Theologie u. Kirche* VIII (1900) 77-78 and *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* L (1905) 341-342. — H. Haupt's necrologue with a list of his works — several of which are of great interest for scholastic studies on the 14th c. — is found in: *Nachrichten der Giessener Hochschul-Gesellschaft* XI, 1 (1936) 15-28. A copy was graciously forwarded to the writer. — I use this opportunity to thank all Libraries which provided microfilms, and all librarians who generously opened their rich stores of knowledge whenever I had to appeal to them.

²⁾ cf. *Jordani de Saxonia Liber Vitasfratrum*, ed. ARBESMANN-HÜMPFNER, O. E. S. A. (New York 1943), Introd. XX, XLVII sq., LIII sq., LVI.

³⁾ By some scholars the *Lectura* of Hiltalinger has been assigned to a rather late date; cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto u. seine theol. Erkenntnislehre* (Würzburg 1941) 99-100. — The chronology of the 14th century is complicated by the fact of the 'marginalia shift' as shown later in this article (see: footnote 17).

⁴⁾ Simon de Cremona O. E. S. A. has left all his Four Books in the MS Cremona 118. On f. 153^v Simon tells us that he held his *Responsio Prima* under Mag. Johannes Romani O. E. S. A. Under the same Magister Romani, Hiltalinger 'answered' in his *Responsio Secunda* (10 RR r. 2). As Romani was in a great hurry to leave Paris (cf. DENIFLE, *Chart.* III n. 1291, p. 111), Simon and Hiltalinger chronologically were very close together because only newly created Magistri used to 'oppose' in a *Responsio*.

before 1368 ; R 7 in Avignon probably at the General Chapter on Pentecost, 1368 ; RR 8-10 in Paris after 1368. The *Magistri Opponentes* of the *Decem Responsiones* were as follows: Johannes Cusin, O. P. (R 1) ; Johannes Romani, O. E. S. A. (R 2) ; Johannes de Calore — later Chancellor of the University (R 5) ; Bartholomaeus de Ripario, O. P. (R 6) ; Facinus de Ast, O. E. S. A. (R 7) ; the *Prior de Zerbona* (R 8) ; Simon Freron of the Navarra College (R 9) ; the Augustinian Nicolaus de Amatrice « *in Aula* » together with the *Magistri Guillelmus Arnaldi* and *Guillelmus* (de Salvarvilla) *Cantor Parisiensis* (R 10).

In the year 1371 Hiltalinger attained the goal of his scholastic career, the Magisterium. With the title of Magister Parisiensis well earned, he left Paris immediately and repeatedly became Provincial of his home province. Rapidly he rose to greater dignities. At the General Chapter of 1377 he was appointed Procurator General of the Order and by virtue of office was henceforth closely associated with the papal Curia. During the election riots of Urban VI it was Baduario-Peraga ⁵⁾, Prior General of the Augustinians, who played his part in tranquillizing the Romans ; and right after the election Hiltalinger, Procurator General of the same Order, had the honor of preaching before the new pope ⁶⁾.

When the French Cardinals left the obedience of Rome, Hiltalinger followed them ⁷⁾ and became anti-general of the Augustinian Order under the Avignon obedience. We need not interpret this decisive step in Hiltalinger's career as political opportunism, because even saints like Vincent Ferrer were in the Avignonese fold and promoted its cause. Hiltalinger was such an active agent for Avignon that Rome finally published against him the *Mandatum captivandi* ⁸⁾, whereupon Avignon made him a bishop at

⁵⁾ cf. D. PERINI, *El B. Buenaventura Baduario-Peraga* (Santiago de Chile 1925) 39. Perini also publishes (*ibid.* 49-50) the Bull of Clement VII which makes Hiltalinger General under Avignon.

⁶⁾ cf. Mich. SEIDLMAYER, *Die Anfänge des grossen abendl. Schismas* (Münster 1940) 279: « Et iste testis [fr. Menendus O. Min.] vidit ipsos septem cardinales in missa cum papa in dicto festo. Et fecit sermonem mag. Johannes de Basilea, et Cardinalis Aragonensis [Petrus de Luna] dixit tunc Evangelium ».

⁷⁾ cf. PERINI, *l. c.*, 49-50.

⁸⁾ cf. Gerd TELLENBACH, *Repertorium Germanicum* II (Berlin 1933) 25 sq. and 28. The same « *Mandatum captivandi* Roberto [Clementi VII] adhaerentes » is issued twice on the same day: March 7, 1389. One addressee is living in the diocese of Basel, the other in Prague. In both *Mandata* « Johannes

Lombes near Lourdes. He died in 1392 and was buried at Freiburg i. B.

Hiltalinger⁹⁾ was a brilliant personality endowed with a surprising capacity for work and organization. He lived in a period of intense literary and theological activity and followed the historical trend of the mid-century theology, leaving us a theological legacy which, without exaggeration, might be called a « *Petit dictionnaire de la théologie du XIV^e siècle* ».

His extant works are a complete *Lectura*, the *Decem Responsiones*, the incomplete *Vesperiae*, and a *Sermo Optimus*. His lost works comprise a *Quolibetum* and a *Lectura super Epistulam*.

Hiltalinger's manuscripts are few: Clm 26 711, Toulouse 248, Fribourg Cordeliers 26, Basel F II 9; Wien Nat. 4319 (10 *Responsiones* + 3 *Quaestiones* from the Third Book), Einsiedeln 45 (*Sermo Optimus*). All manuscripts are of a date close to Hiltalinger's; two of them (Basel F II 9 and Toulouse 248) were even manuals of Hiltalinger himself.

The manuscripts of Peter Gracilis, O. E. S. A., Jacobus de Altavilla, O. Cist., Henricus de Hassia and Angelus Dobelin, O. E. S. A., are of great help because they often copy from Hiltalinger whose extant works will be published in about five volumes within a few years.

To put Hiltalinger in the correct perspective, it is necessary first to characterize the context and the framework of 14th c. theology. This is not an easy task since sweeping generalizations have created the impression that the mid-century theology is blasé and eclectic, sophisticated and skeptic, fitting into the strait-jacket of nominalism¹⁰⁾. As a matter of fact, the theology of the 14th century is still under a cloud and could stand further probing.

de Basilea alias dictus de Hiltelingen » heads a list of fifteen persons to be captured.

⁹⁾ A more detailed biography of this great son of St. Augustine will be published apart.

¹⁰⁾ « Nominalism » as applied to the 14th century seems to be a retroactive terminology. In years of MSS studies I have never found the term « nominalista » in any MS before 1385. The 15th century used this epithet for the 14th c. theologians who in reality called themselves « Moderni ». In an article on « Nominalism » (*Dict. Théol. Cath.* XI, 1: 717-784), P. Vignaux simply postulates

Moderni = Occamistae

Occamistae = Nominalistae

Ergo Moderni = Nominalistae Q. E. D.

Tempted to find another common denominator one might identify the mid-century theology as positive and historical-minded. Going through the texts of the 14th century the observing reader cannot fail to ascertain that several of these decried theologians saw the urgent need of revitalizing their speculation through better firsthand research in older sources, especially Augustine, Proclus, Dionysius, Boethius, Anselm, Lincolniensis, etc.

At least three facts can be adduced to prove this changed mentality of the 14th century. First, better facilities for quoting were generally adopted by 1350, especially codified capitulations of those Fathers and *Authentici* whom the scholastics were wont to consult. Second, the esteem for older manuscripts, already noticeable at the beginning of the 14th century, was greatly on the increase. Third, there did exist a group of theologians who prided themselves on their accuracy of quoting.

A positive mentality never develops suddenly. When by the mid-century we find that the chapter division of the Fathers and *Authentici* was well advanced in the stage of codification, we must realize that we are approaching the end of a long process which presupposes that the scribes had consciously and conscientiously copied chapters and chapter numbers for many years. Today, after the advent of print, it would be enough to edit one copy in order to codify chapter divisions. In the age of the manuscript, however, generations of copyists had to be convinced of the importance of these numbers; otherwise, they would never have been generally adopted.

The many *Tabulae*¹¹⁾, especially the *Milleloquium Augustini* and the *Milleloquium Ambrosii*, would never have been possible without established chapter division. The chapter division in its turn could not have been codified nor widely used without the

¹¹⁾ About *Tabulae* cf. J. GHELLINCK, *Patristique... au bas moyen âge*, in: *Geisteswelt des Mittelalters* (Baeumker's Beiträge Suppl. III, 1 [Münster 1935] 423 ff. — For the two monumental *Milleloquia* cf. D. PERINI, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* I (Firenze 1929) 203 f: *Carusi* Fr. Bartholomaeus de Urbino (died 1350). More MSS are indicated by P. B. MINISTERI, *De Augustini de Ancona ... operibus*, in: *Analecta Augustiniana* XXII, 2 (1952) 223 f. — Vincent A. FITZPATRICK, M. S. SS. T., has just finished (June 1954) a Dissertation under Dr. B. Peebles of the Catholic University of America, Washington: *Bartholomaeus of Urbino, The Sermons embraced in his Milleloquium S. Augustini* (pp. 124) which blazes the trail for learned research concerning this *Milleloquium*.

facile Arabic number system, the triumph of which remains forever the glorious achievement of the 14th century.

'Capitulation' is the basic quoting facility in any period; in the present era of print pagination ranks next. In the age of the manuscript, 'foliation' corresponded to our pagination. Due to variation in size it was impossible to give each copy of a particular work the same *folia*, and therefore, the marginal cyclic letter system was invented, which, if generally adopted, would have made quoting independent of the *folium*. When we find that text divisions of certain 14th c. MSS. are marked by recurring letter cycles A-Z, AA-AZ, BA-BZ, CA-CZ, ... ZA-ZZ, we have an indication of erudite concern about convenient quoting facilities.

To illustrate the usage of this scrupulous method of quoting, we note these few examples from Hiltalinger's *Decem Respon- siones* (10 RR), where Dionysius is quoted by letter system:

cap. 5 parte 11 vel secundum alium modum	
	littera L: 10 RR r. 4
cap. 7 littera G:	10 RR r. 4
cap. 2 parte 2 vel littera B:	10 RR r. 4
cap. 5 littera F et littera G:	10 RR r. 4
cap. 5 et signanter circa finem litterae E:	10 RR r. 4
cap. 8 littera D usque F et cap. 7 a littera F	
usque H inclusive ubi littera G dicit:	10 RR r. 5
cap. 8 littera G:	10 RR r. 5

There are numerous other examples, but these may suffice to show that the printers had not to invent any new quoting facilities. Yet the amanuenses of the 14th century by their passive resistance remonstrated against this cyclic letter system¹²⁾ and

¹²⁾ From MSS in my possession I give the following examples: Vat. lat. 1083 (Johannes de Ripa, In Primum) where the amanuensis gets tired of the cyclic letters after three pecias. — Erfurt CA 2^o 115 (Facinus de Ast) where the copyist gives up on f. 41 — A third example is an Augustinian chartulary of Clare (England) MS Harl. 4835 which does not prove very much as the copy is from the 15th century; every item of his chartulary is marked by cyclically returning letters. Among the items is one containing the oldest proof for the authenticity of Giles' *De erroribus philosophorum*; MS Harl. 4835 f. 49^r (letter: FO, date: Jan. 15, 1317): «Ego frater Johannes de Waldyngfelde mutuo recepi de Conventu Clare tertium scriptum Thome in uno volumine et tractatum Egidii de erroribus philosophorum, et de materia celi, in alio volumine ad ter-

therefore it could not become common usage in all MSS. Thus the quoting facility of the cyclic letter system remained a sporadic and unsuccessful attempt.

Another feature of the 14th century commentaries was much more successful in providing good quoting faculties. Many MSS adopted the mathematical pattern of detailed text division. In his *Quaestiones*, Hiltalinger used the pattern $3 \times 3 \times 3$, which allowed for as many as thirty subdivisions. At the beginning of each *Quaestio*, we have:

- 3 *Rationes Principales*, then the *Oppositum* folowed by
- 3 *Conclusiones*, each with some *Contra* and their *Solutio* ;
- 3 *Corollaria* (after each *Conclusio*), also with *Contra* and *Solutio*.

In the *Decem Responsiones* Hiltalinger used the $10 \times 3 \times 4$ pattern which was even richer in quotable subdivisions. Thus at the beginning of each *Responsio* we find some *Rationes Principales*, then

10 *Notabilia* for term definition, then

3 *Conclusiones*, each with

4 *Corollaria*, followed by a report on Hiltalinger's 'Responsiones' to the Magister or the Magistri who 'opposed' him.

By its very nature the mathematical text division is sometimes forced¹³). A logical text cannot like molten lead be poured into a pre-established number of empty trays. Hiltalinger is honest enough to tell us that many subdivisions were added later for the sake of conforming with the pre-established pattern. In questions like *Prologus* and *Vesperiae* Hiltalinger gave up the strict text division and used a more flexible system though lacking in provision for the same neat quoting facility.

minum vite mee conservandum atque post obitum meum predicto conventui restituendum... in die s. Mauri abbatis anno Domini MCCC septimo decimo». — A fourth example may be found in Vat. lat. 986 f. 73^r-79^v: where eight times the cycle A-G is repeated on the margins by a careless copyist. These eight «A-G» correspond to eight *folia* in the original, from which the copy was made. It is the cyclic letter system which early prints use to subdivide *one folium* as we see it in the recently reprinted *Summa Gandavensis*.

¹³) John of Ripa, in his *Determinationes*, ridicules his opponent [Mag. Ascensius, O. Min.] because Ascensius likes a text division based on the 'pattern 10'; cf. Vat. lat. 981 f. 24^r = Pal. lat. 566 f. 205^v = Arch. S. Piet. G 37 f. 46^r: «Sed volebat complere denarium rationum quem numerum etiam in Lectionibus et Tractatibus suo usui dedicaverat; et propter hoc etiam aliquae rationes suae in idem coincidebant». — For Ascensius see footnote 17.

Another quoting facility was the 'foliation' of the manuscripts. By 1350 most MSS had numbered folia. Ordinarily the folia are numbered on the *recto*, but in Vat. Lat. 4353 (Rich. Chillington) the *verso* is apparently numbered. 'Foliation' was a quoting facility which benefitted only those who had access to one particular manuscript.

At first sight the modern reader is amazed to see Hiltalinger quote the *Postilla super can. Johannis* fol. 7 — fol. 12 — fol. 34 — fol. 41 — fol. 42 — fol. 45 — fol. 65, or the *Postilla super Actus Apostolorum* fol. 56. Both are lost works of Johannes Klenkok¹⁴), but even if they should be recovered, these quotations would be of little help since each MS must naturally differ in 'foliation'.

To get a better understanding of the meaning of 'foliation', let us take an example from Petrus de Ceffons (*In Quattuor Sententiarum*, MS Troyes 62), which does make sense and explains other instances. Like other scholastics of the 14th century. Petrus sent his *scriptor* out to obtain correct quotations from the desired books in a local library. On fol. 47^v of the Troyes MS 62 this *scriptor*, Guillelmus de Capella (Guilleville ?), is advised to consult the Gregory copy on fol. 28. As the « *scriptor* » well knew which copy was meant the direction was well given¹⁵).

¹⁴) MS Toulouse 248 (Hiltalinger, *In Primum et In Quartum*) always writes: « Kleinkoch ».

¹⁵) At the end of 1 Sent. q. 20 Petrus gives a sketchy outline for further development of q. 20: « Unde contra hoc arguit Chaton q. 2 Prologi art. 1: Recita dicta Chatonis et responde ad argumenta opinionis quam tangit Landulphus. Et move haec duo dubia, primum... secundum, Utrum brutum formet complexam; quod sic: in Gregorio, per quattuor argumenta, lib. 1 dist. 3 q. 1 folio 28. Et dubita si velis ad illa... Dubita hic de fascinatione sicut Quol. 3 q. 12 [Henrici Gandavensis] ». Apparently the *scriptor* Guillelmus preferred to have no doubts; he certainly did not go out of his way to get the texts but was absent-minded enough to copy the Master's directions for the benefit of the modern reader. Several other directions of Petrus remained pious wishes. cf. f. 57^r: « Ki^{ton} [Chillington] tenet oppositum; cuius dicta per manum scriptoris hic extrahi feci, et hic annecti de verbo ad verbum (on the margin was the direction which the amanuensis scrambled with the text without obeying the direction: Antevertantur haec folia; in quolibet ponantur dicta Ki^{tonis}). Hoc animadverto quia nec laudabile est... a nimis truncato repetere verba hominum et illa dimittere quae eis possent plurimum suffragari. Ideo communiter feci per alias partes scribi de verbo ad verbum

The example just quoted throws a different light on the case of Hiltalinger, whose 'folium quotations' were personal notes to be deleted from the final edition, as their usefulness would then have ceased. Hiltalinger never found the time to copy the actual texts from the *Postillae* nor to suppress, subsequently, those 'folium quotations'. Thus they remained, characteristically all in the Fourth Book, which when compared with the First Book and the *Decem Responsiones* ranks lower in editorial finesse.

A second fact supporting our conviction that the 14th c. theologians were historical-minded is their love for older MSS which they shared with the primitive humanists. Mention has been made of the humanistic theologian, Petrus de Ceffons. The Augustinian Luigi Marsili¹⁶⁾ is also noted for having mixed theological reasoning with the « belli e buoni detti » of classical pagans. In Hiltalinger, too, there are traces of a new humanism. Not only did he allow the Muse of the classics and of Petrarch to chime in occasionally, but by his bombastic Latin he also attempted to improve the theological Latin of the 13th century, an attempt which has to be considered as a failure.

An even better argument follows from the fact that humanism originated in an age when education lay in the hands of theologians. To explain the growing love for classical MSS we must postulate love for theological MSS, because only when led by the trend of their theological vocation to appreciate theological MSS could some 14th c. theologians develop an interest in classical MSS as their avocation. Any other explanation is hardly possible.

sicut iacebant in scripto dicta illa quae impugnare decreveram, ut totalis eorum panderetur intentio et inspiceretur quomodo res ultimate se haberet». ** The loquacious Perus certainly was not the only one to feel that the *auctoritates* should be looked up carefully in the original sources. — Petrus left us a very large Commentary which teems with classical and semi-classical poetry and shows great interest in natural sciences. He read after 1347, his *Socii* being Magister Grimerius, Magister Laurentius, Dominus Prior Magister Johannes. He often vents his resentment against the condemnations of 1347; because he thinks that the venerable Masters of the mid-century and their enthusiastic quest for truth deserved a better fate: approval rather than harsh condemnation. — In his introductory letter which I shall publish, he thunders against three foreign « *Vetulae* » whom he expects the king of France to banish because of their share in engineering the condemnations. — One may not be surprised to learn that Petrus never became Magister but remained Baccalarius for life.

¹⁶⁾ cf. PERINI: *Bibl. Aug.* II, 182 sq. — For Augustinian humanism cf. R. ARBESMANN, *Outstanding Augustinian Humanists*, in: *Tagestan* 10 (1947) 101-112.

The third fact alleged in favor of our postulate that a historical mentality existed among the 14th c. theologians, is evident to anyone who reads their texts. The 'Quidam quotations' become increasingly rarer in the 14th century. Their abundance in texts of the 13th century makes editing difficult and evaluating problematical as the authors seem to be the more original the more their sources are unknown. Many a good theologian of the *Antiqui* would be called eclectic if he had indicated his sources as carefully as Hiltalinger did or if the editors had been successful in tracking down all implicit quotations.

In the 14th century the 'Quidam quotations' are more the exception than the rule with a large group of writers. In Hiltalinger they form an insignificant fraction among his five to six thousand quotations.

An old rule prescribed that living authors should not be impugned by budding Baccalarii; for the sake of peace they were to be impugned anonymously. Yet there must have been a tradition, culminating in authors like Hiltalinger, which permitted marginal annotation of the real names during the *Lectura*, and authorized their insertion in the text before publication. This 'marginalia shift' creates one of the most serious problems in dating 14th century manuscripts as many names were shifted into the text body with anachronistic titles, i. e., a Frater Titius could be transferred from the margin to the text as Master Titius, or Cancellarius Titius, or Patriarcha Titius, although he had no such title at the time of the *Lectura* but only chanced to become a dignitary before the date of the work's publication¹⁷).

Little by little a certain group of theologians expected to find no *Quidam* in their sources. Hiltalinger in 3 Sent. q. 18 once voices his regret in regard to Astensis: « Et concordat Astensis lib. 1

¹⁷) Some scholars have dated the *Lectura* of Hiltalinger too late because they overlooked this 'marginalia-shift'. If the argument of titles which Hiltalinger gave to Hugolinus at the moment of publication (« Generalis noster », viz., 1368-71) were valid for dating the *Lectura* reading, the Third Book of Hiltalinger would have been read after 1381, as Johannes de Calore is called in the Third Book « tunc Cancellarius Parisiensis ». [see later in this article]. * A beautiful example of 'marginalia shift' we have in the *Determinationes* of Johannes de Ripa. The name of the addressee against whom the *Determinationes* were written, was placed by Johannes de Ripa only on the margins of his copy. On the margins of one MS, viz., Pal. lat. 566 it still occurs, namely Magister Ascensius

titulo 19 art. 2 cum doctoribus quos recitat ibidem; non tamen nominat eos »¹⁸).

Some commentaries of the second half of the 14th century continue the former custom of quoting most of their 'authorities' under the anonymity of *Quidam*. In the case of Ripa's '*Quidam* commentary', however, we know that it is a *Lectura Reportata*, published « eodem anno », 1357, without any further editing. The *Quidam* of Ripa's MS therefore remained in his extant *Reportata* copies¹⁹), while the names, if any, appeared only on the margins of Ripa's own manual copy.

The '*Quidam* commentaries' make at least one exception regarding names: they usually give great attention to exactness in

[Aquitanus de S. Columba, O. Min. cf. SBARALEA I, 104]. At least twice this important key name was shifted into the text body:

- 1^o Vat. lat. 981 f. 49^r: Magister An^{lus}
 = Arch. S. Piet. G 37 f. 71^v: Magister Au.
 = Pal. lat. 566 f. 259^r: Magister Ascen^o
- 2^o Vat. lat. 981 f. 51^v: Magistrum Austere
 = Arch. S. Piet. G 37 f. 74^r: Magistrum Aust.
 = Pal. lat. 566 f. 264^v: Magistrum Ascen^m

¹⁸) B. M. XIBERTA, *De scriptoribus O. Carm.* (Louvain 1931) 63 mentions a chapter decree of 1416 which reflects upon the 14th century: « Item quia doctores nostri ordinis propter negligentiam cursorum veniunt in oblivionem quia nolunt eos in suis actibus *sub suis nominibus propriis allegare*... mandamus omnibus et singulis baccalariis et cursoribus quod deinceps nostros rememorentur doctores *allegando eos* in suis actibus tam in principiis quam in responsionibus... » — In the introductory letter of *Petrus de Ceffons* we hear of a « mandatum maiorum » to quote (MS Troyes 62 f. 2^r): « Et advertat vestra discretio quod dum festinanter scriberem aliqua de dictis aliorum cum dictis propriis immiscui et multoties allegavi. Haec enim quandoque ex mandato feci maiorum; et etiam gloriabar priscorum dictis veracibus me quomodolibet coaptare. Ea tamen secundum vestrae discretionis [Guillemi de Capella] amplitudinem inserere vel rescindere poteritis ». ** This gusto for exact quoting makes *Alfonsus Vargas Toletanus* a mine of information; a reprint was therefore made in New York to be released when the MSS check-up is finished. For Alfonsus cf. J. KÜRZINGER, *Alfonsus Vargas Toletanus*, in *Baumker's Beiträge* XXII, 5-7 (Münster 1930) 41 ff.

¹⁹) A *Lectura Reportata* was one written by a student in the classroom (ab ore magistri); if copies were made directly from such a *Lectura Reportata* they naturally could not show the wealth and precision of quotations which we admire in the works of an author like Hiltalinger who did carefully edit the first draft, whether *Reportatum* or not.

quoting from St. Augustine ²⁰). To this extent they acknowledge the new mentality.

Up to this point we have been dealing with the historical trend among the theologians of the 14th century in general. Later we shall corroborate the third of our alleged facts on the basis of Augustinian quotations in Hiltalinger. The impact of these arguments will make itself felt when the reader is able to check with the forthcoming edition of Hiltalinger's works.

But first a few remarks on the importance of our postulate. If « Back to the sources » was a characteristic demand with 14th c. theologians, it will shed new light on the puzzle of their so-called eclecticism.

It was in the sources that many new ideas were found which

²⁰) In *Facinus de Ast* MS Erfurt Amplon. 2^o 115, Augustinian quotations are carefully underlined. Ripa, too, quotes Augustine with painstaking care. * In two MSS of *Ripa's Lectura* (Vat. lat. 1083, Vat. lat. 6738) the colophon bears the date, Dec. 16, 1357, with the remark « ab ore magistri ». As each of these two colophons was written by a different writer, the date cannot refer to the time of copying. — If the Four Books were to be read, the First Book had to be finished around the 16th of December. — *Ripa's Lectura* was published « eodem anno » (1357); see below p. 433. Between 1357 and 1361 (at least) the *Determinations* of Ripa were written because the addressee of the *Determinationes* — Ascensius [Austensius Aquitanus de S. Columba] who became Magister in 1352 — was made bishop in 1361; cf. SBARALEA I, 104. Before 1361 Ripa was Magister; cf. *Determinationes* Vat. lat. 981 f. 69^v = Pal. lat. 566 f. 314^v = Arch. S. Piet. G 37 f. 96^r: « Istam [conclusionem] aliquantulum deduxi in *Vesperis* [meis]. * But is it possible that the Lector Johannes Hiltalinger could have assisted (at Avignon ?) at the *Responsiones* of the Baccalarius Formatus, Johannes de Ripa ? cf. Hiltalinger's 2 Sent. q. 22: « Ad hanc rationem *audiui respondere* Johannem de Ripa dicendo quod argumenta fundantur super falso quia imaginantur... quod *ipse dicebat* esse falsum ». — The feud between Ascensius and Ripa led the antagonists from one university to another; cf. *Determinationes* Vat. lat. 981 f. 21^v = Pal. lat. 566 f. 200^r = Arch. S. Piet. G 37 f. 42^v: « Alias expresse posuit [Ascensius] et publice in hac universitate et alibi me audiente [Johanne de Ripa] ». — After the revocation of *Ludovicus' de Padua* (*Vesperiae* 1362), it seems, Ripa was considered to have been condemned implicitly; cf. Hiltalinger 10 RR r. 10: « Ex his evaditur sufficienter error Johannis de Ripa et Doctoris Profundi in materia ista, qui posuerunt intrinsecam contingentiam sive indifferentiam — et hoc in actu voluntatis divinae; ex eodem ostenditur multiplex error *Ludovici de Padua in Vesperis suis* in materia ista ». cf. A. COMBES, Jean Gerson (1940) 623-673; and COMBES, *Un inédit de S. Anselme d'après Ripa* (1944) 16; both in: *Etudes de phil. médiévale* (Gilson) tom. XXX and XXXIV.

had to act like chemical reagents, dissolving the proud systems of the 13th century. No wonder therefore that in the name of alleged discoveries the *Moderni* started to attack the systems which are dear to us again today. Yet this attack should not leave the casual reader with the idea that theologians like Hiltalinger belonged to a tired group of irreverent eclectics. The *Moderni* themselves would have been amused at such a charge. If ever a theological group was animated by intellectual enthusiasm, it was the pleiad of Masters around 1350 who claimed to have rediscovered many an old truth and therefore felt entitled to insert their 'discoveries' into the lofty structures of 13th century ²¹). It is true, they made so many structural additions that the old systems lost character and stability; yet, negative designs did not animate them as they were hoping to construct new systems which, alas, did not materialize.

The *Schola Modernorum* was infected by some dangerous and deadly germs which could have brought about its decay but its collapse is due to a process which might best be described with the quip: « It was not their theology which ran out first: it was their theologians! ». The Black Death thinned their ranks; the condemnations of the mid-century drove some into other fields like humanism — as we can read between the lines of Petrus de Ceffons. In 1368 the freedom of research was limited by the proclamation of the first *Authenticus*, i. e., 'Doctor of a School' in

²¹) Dissent from the Old Masters does not imply irreverence as far as Hiltalinger is concerned. Against Richard Fitzralph of Ardmagh [Armacanus] who belittles the Friars as « Viri illiterati » Hiltalinger observes acidly (10 RR r. 3): « Quid igitur de S. Thoma de Aquino? Numquid ipsum idiotam reputabit de cuius fructu operum satiata est terra? Quid de Aegidio, Bonaventura, Scoto, et de aliis luminaribus ecclesiae sanctae dei? — When Bartholomaeus de Castellione [= Guido Terreni!] in his *De perfectione vitae*, parte 2 cap. 18 (MS Avignon 299 f. 56^r sq.) says that « Thomas erronee scripsit », Hiltalinger (10 RR r. 5) feels compelled to recast this criticism into a milder form, though a perusal of the Avignon MS shows that Guido had just as much esteem for the recently canonized Thomas as Hiltalinger. — The latter also accords great respect to the Masters of his own Order whom he calls *schola nostra*, *Doctores nostri* (be they Antiqui or Moderni). About 30 times he mentions them as a group with uniformity of habit rather than of doctrine. 200 times he quotes *Aegidius* with flattering titles (« Dominus Aegidius Magnus ») which he omits when he contradicts him!

the modern sense. By 1372 the privileges of the Masters were curtailed, along with their vote in the chapter.

The death knell of the *Schola Modernorum* rang when the schism destroyed the scholastic standards of Paris by subordinating the academic world, its institutions and its magisterial dignities, to political expediency. It was bound to happen that professors of good Parisian stock became rarer and rarer within one or two generations; the chairs had to be filled by more and more *epigoni* whose literary productions were petering out in a few second-rate manuscripts. Thus the pendulum swung back to the *Antiqui*. Some of the *Moderni* were still copied, but the school was at an end. With the advent of the age of print, the *Moderni* were quickly forgotten. If printing had been invented a hundred years earlier, history might have been different; for a group such as the *Moderni* would surely have seen that the Fathers were printed before the Protestant attack against tradition gained volume.

Even so, we can say that an attempt at historical theology was made in the 14th century, but unfortunately the bud was nipped before it could unfold. All that remained was a bad name.

A postulated historical trend can give its own context also to the so-called 'nominalism' of the 14th century.

From the sources came not only new ideas but new terms and consequently a taste for a new terminology which broke with the crystal clear and homely language of the *Antiqui*. We may call the latinity of the *Moderni* bombastic: Ciceronian tastes may be shocked by it: yet, the learned language of the West was enriched by the abstract terms of this century which had no linguistic inhibitions. The terminology of the *Moderni* required endless *Notabilia* for the explanation of their ever shifting terms. If 14th century theology is to be described as 'nominalism' we must not forget its long-winded logomachies; we come much closer to the truth if we interpret 'nominalism' etymologically as 'terminalism' i. e. a school which had to struggle with the hydra of its own terminology ²²).

²²) cf. XIBERTA, *De scriptoribus O. Carm.* (Louvain 1931) 474 n. 2: «Fortasse in hac ratione quaestionum pertractandarum est insigne [characteristic], immo et ratio nominis realismi et nominalismi, magis quam in solutione problematis de universalibus, cuius momentum et influxum in totam scientiam plurimi [?] scholastici non assequebantur.

'Skepticism' is still the blackest mark on the record of the 14th century theology. Many have made the accusation, some have pleaded for conviction but I hope that the judges will pause before they render the final verdict. What we call 'skepticism of the 14th century' was partly the result of the shocked surprise at the different atmosphere surrounding and pervading the sources; partly it was the consequence of a *Logica Moderna* gone wild; to a large degree it was the outcome of a pseudo-scientific ideal which pretended to treat a theological question 'more geometrico'.

In their enthusiastic quest for truth the *Moderni* hitched their chariot to the proud star of mathematical evidence²³), depreciating philosophy in favor of theology, depreciating likewise the created in favor of the absolute and eternal. Untroubled by any fears of heresy in a world all Christian, and apparently united forever, the *Moderni* distinguished the mathematical concept of *evidens* from the workaday certainty of *probabile*. Their use of the term *probabile* was the most fatal feature of their system, even though it meant 'provable' rather than 'probable'.

They applied the term *probabile* to a proof for the existence of God, not because a man of healthy intuition cannot be led to the threshold of faith through sound reasoning, but rather because a stubborn unbeliever (*proterviens*) cannot be forced into intellectual submission. In the dangerous distinction of *evidens-probabile* the *evidens* was too narrow and the *probabile* too broad. Moreover, the term *probabile* was so often abused in arguments of plain theological casuistry that it finally became discredited and assumed the meaning of 'probable'. Nevertheless, it would seem a little slanderous to accuse the whole pleiad of venerable Masters in the fifties and sixties of skepticism, for it is incredible that cardinals, bishops and priors-general should have been guilty of such cynicism without being corrected.

²³) *Petrus de Cejjons* (MS Troyes 62 f. 1r) describes the mathematical deductive method of the 14th century in many lyrical passages: « More scientiarum mathematicarum, arithmeticae praesertim vel geometriae, quarum dicta sequentia praecedentibus innituntur... qualiter [in horologio] ex unius rotae circumductae gyro plurium sequitur per intermedia volubilium rotarum motus, tandemque delectabilis harmonia concluditur miro sonitu campanarum!... Suppositiones ipsas rotis, conclusiones seu corollaria sonantibus aequare moliebar campanulis ». Even if Peter had not put it in so many words, this literary ideal

HILTALINGER'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS QUOTING

I

In his more than five thousand references, Hiltalinger quotes Holy Scripture very often, the scholastics about two thousand times, his own Augustinians around one thousand times. Occasionally he is apologetic about his extensive quoting.

At the end of the 10 RR r. 3, he sounds rather fatigued: « *In qua potius volui sententias doctorum recitare quam propria phantasmata multiplicare* »; but then we must not forget that the 10 RR r. 3 deals with the old, mooted question of poverty.

Within the 10 RR r. 3, at the end of the 10 *Notabilia*, he says: « *Nec indignetur aliquis de multitudine remissionis et allegationis, non solum dictorum sed etiam auctorum, quia ut dicit Apuleius De deo Socratis...* ». The Apuleius quotation, also found with neat cross reference in the dedication of the *Decem Responsiones* to Gyso of Colonia, O. E. S. A., makes it plain that as we have already many perfectly cut stones in our theological tradition, we need only build them into our edifice. In other words, Hiltalinger quotes so often to save the past from oblivion.

would be plain to see in the commentaries of the 14th century with their mathematical text division, their mathematical deductive method, their mathematical examples, and their love for quotations from authors like *Alanus* (*Regulae theologicae*), *Alexander* (*De memoria rerum difficilium* = *Definitiones XXIV Philosophorum*) etc. who reason « more geometrico ». * *Johannes de Ripa* (*In Primum*), however, does not think very much of mathematical examples; cf. Vat. lat. 1083 f. 131^v: « *Omnia ista exempla mathematica de figuris et excessibus angulorum sunt multo deridenda si quis cupit attingere ad indaginem veritatis* ». — Ripa's system, an enrapturing 'world of light', is an advanced development of the Gandavensis; cf. Vat. lat. 1083 f. 140^v: « *[Gandavensis] mihi fuit pater* ». A key passage which an opponent singles out for the marginal criticism 'Deberet probare', stresses the almost static features of this visionary 'world of light'; cf. Vat. lat. 1083 f. 43^v: « *Et ideo potius vitalis potentia dicitur locus quam subiectum huiusmodi actionum vitalium; immo per accidens est subiectum ipsarum inquantum contingit huiusmodi actiones esse qualitates potentiam informantes. Quapropter multo sanius diceretur, secundum meum propositum, deum esse visionem vel notitiam 'obiectivam' creaturae quam 'formalem' quoniam per 'formalem' communiter intelligitur formalitas inexistentialis communicativae divini esse. Et ideo in hoc verbo < 'formalis' > videtur latere venenum. Sed oportet pro nunc termino isto uti* ».

Toward the end of 10 RR r. 2, Hiltalinger defends his many 'remissiones' thus « *Sed quia aliquae rationes circa ccl. 1 et 2 communiter moventur, ideo infrascriptas remissiones aestimo in hac quaestione notandas* ». He then 'remits' to Durandus, Aegidius, Petrus de Tarentasia, Richardus de Mediavilla, St. Thomas, Thomas de Argentina etc., evidently anxious to present a possibly complete 'status quaestionis'.

In 1 Sent. q. 15, we find another and very natural reason for extensive quoting: « *Et ne videar falsum imponere [Johanni de Ripa], recito verba sua in forma* ». Here as in many other places it is a sense of fairness which makes Hiltalinger quote.

A curious instance of 1 Sent. q. 8 must be mentioned: « *Ad ista respondeo et quia difficilia sunt, appodiabo me ad dicta doctorum* ». After quoting only Anselm and the Gandavensis, Hiltalinger for once seems to restrain his quoting verve by saying: « *Visis horum doctorum dictis, nullius < alterius dicta > sunt valoris* ». But it is certainly amusing to find that he later felt the urge to add more: « *Pro solutione tamen eorum est etiam notandum illud quod ait S. Thomas q. 4 De veritate art. 2* ». This second 'text stratum', a long quotation from St. Thomas, is already incorporated in all MSS. But the MS Toulouse 248, and it alone, superimposes upon the preceding strata still another quotation giving us thereby the example of a triple 'stratification' ²⁴⁾ of Hiltalinger's text. It shows at the same time that quoting had become a habit with men like our Magister Johannes who again and again went over the wide field of theological literature to glean what they could from the mature speculation of the past.

Hiltalinger's admiration for the past is voiced expressly in 2 Sent. q. 3, where we find him making a bow to the theological erudition of Lombard and Hugo: « *Credo tamen eos [Lombardum et Hugonem] volumina sanctorum tanta diligentia sicut suos posteros studuisse* ».

II

The theologians of the 14th century were 'happy quoters' who carried into their texts quotations upon quotation because in

²⁴⁾ cf. F. PETRARCA, *Invective contra medicum*, ed. Pier Giorgio RICCI (Roma 1950); introduzione 18.

their own minds as well as in those of their contemporaries this feature increased the value of their literary productions. The fact that they had already released their books to the public did not prevent these 'busy bees' from filling the margins of any copy of their works which afterwards chanced to fall into their hands.

Thus Hiltalinger who read the Sentences ca. 1365-66 made marginal annotations as late as 1381. In his 3 Sent. q. 12 we read: « *Sed contra dicta potest argui secundum quod Magister Johannes de Calore, tunc Cancellarius Parisiensis, arguebat* ». The qualification « *tunc Cancellarius* » implies that Johannes de Calore was no longer in office when Hiltalinger was writing this note, and from Denifle we know that the successor of Johannes de Calore was in office on July 15, 1381²⁵).

The extensive editing efforts made by Hiltalinger enabled him to quote himself about 200 times with formulas in all three tenses: *Videtur*, *Videbitur*, *Visum est*. As regards chronology, these 'self-quotations' serve as a rule no useful purpose. Some are typical examples of the so-called 'stratification' of 14th century texts. Now and then the cross references in Hiltalinger's works yield some general information; from them we glean the titles of works which have been lost: he wrote a *Quolibetum* and a *Lectura super Epistulam*. We learn also that the 14th century *Responsio* could be called *Quaestio Ordinaria* and that it was held in the morning; we hear that the *Quaestio* of a 14th century commentary was called *Lectio* and as a rule was to be read on one day; it is likely then that the whole Four Books of Hiltalinger [36+29+19+26 QQ] were actually delivered in one year.

From a remark in the First Book we construe that it was the author's intention to place the *Vesperiae* « *in fine Lecturae* » where they de facto are found in the Clm 26 711. We are thus left with little hope of finding a more complete edition of the *Vesperiae* than the incomplete one we have.

The most remarkable 'self-quotation' is to be found on the margin of F II 9 f. 140^v, within the *Secundum Principium*, extant only in this Basel manuscript. Unbelievable as it may sound, it is a specimen of Hiltalinger's own handwriting, characterized by the

²⁵) cf. DENIFLE, *Chartularium* III: n. 1458 and 1461 (p. 298 and 301 respectively). Johannes de Calore was still acting on May 6, 1381; and had a new successor on July 15, 1381.

customary illegibility of the scholar who has plied a speedy quill for many years. The marginal note on f. 140^v reads:

Item Doctor Sanctus lib. 3 dist. 17 q. 1 art. 2 in solutione primae rationis: In Christo sunt duae naturae integrae quarum una non est pars alterius, ex quibus immediate persona componitur. — Item Anselmus I Cur deus homo cap. 6 quod incipit « Ut breviter dicam » vel secundum alium librum, quod incipit « Sufficere nobis debet »²⁶): Dominum Jesum Christum dicimus verum deum et verum hominem et unam personam in duabus naturis, et duas naturas in una persona. — Hoc dicit magis expresse²⁷ De incarnatione cap. 2; et habetur auctoritas in *Tertio meo* dist. 1 concl. 2 corollario 3.

The handwriting of this note is different from that of the text. It also differs from the characters of another amanuensis in the F II 9, who also bears the name Johannes de Basilea²⁸).

No one but Johannes Hiltalinger de Basilea was entitled to write « in *Tertio meo* » if Anselm's quotation « *De incarnatione cap. 2* » occurs, as it does, with the same mistake (« cap. 2 ») in Hiltalinger's *Tertio* dist. 1 concl. 2 corollario 3.

The note « *vel secundum alium librum* », is typically Hiltalinger's style. A cross reference at the quoted place « in *Tertio* » of Hiltalinger makes the proof more stringent: « *De his plura habentur in Principiis et Vesperis meis* ». Obviously, this refers back to the *Secundum Principium* — with or without the note — since the text, parallel to the note, pertains to the running feud between Hiltalinger and the *Dominus Michael* (Süchenschatz ?) *de Zerbona* over the *duae naturae*²⁹). The authorship, therefore,

²⁶) Both 'capitulation incipits' and the quoted text are in Anselm's I Cur deus homo cap. 8; ed. F. S. SCHMITT II (Edinburgh 1946) 59.

²⁷) « magis expresse » refers to Anselm's Ep. De incarnatione Verbi cap. 11; cf. ed. F. S. SCHMITT II, 28: lines 23-25. The wrong 'capitulation': « cap. 2 » (which also occurs in the *In Tertium*) is not improved by the equally wrong one, found in the *Vesperiae*, i. e., « cap. 5 ». The mistakes go back to a misreading [Roman 2 = 11 = angular Arabic 5].

²⁸) This second Johannes de Basilea is a Friar Preacher, Prior of the Dominican House of Wien, AD 1411, the year he holds his *Principia* at the Austrian University; cf. MS Wien 4593 ff. 100^r, 100^v, 106^v, 110^r, 110^v (*Dominus Prior*), 111^r, 111^v.

²⁹) The Socius of Hiltalinger « *Dominus Michael de Zerbona* » may be identified with Michael Süchenschatz of Wien, because he copied Hiltalinger's *Decem Responsiones* with his own hand (MS Wien 4319) and added some lines at the end which concern the « *duae naturae in Christo* », theme of discussion

is absolutely certain. The penmanship likewise may very naturally be assumed to be Hiltalinger's.

There may be the hypercritical 'proterviens' who maintains that Hiltalinger's little note did not become absorbed into the text in some preceding copy, but was again placed on the margin of the MS F II 9 by some lucky finder of this precious relic. This artificial theory loses all probability when we consider that we have and have always had very few MSS of Hiltalinger, owing to the 'damnatio memoriae' which followed almost immediately after the editing of his works.

Since F II 9 is a 14th century MS, the time element does not permit the supposition of three successive MSS of the *Secundum Principium*: first, one without the note; second, one which omitted the note; third, one which was belatedly enriched by the note.

While the fragmentary nature of the *Secundum Principium* explains why we have no *Tertium Principium* nor a *Quartum Principium*, it also shifts the *Secundum Principium* toward a very late date; noteworthy also is the fact that the *In Secundum* itself was published by Hiltalinger after the *In Primun* and the *Decem Responsiones*.

An examination of other Hiltalinger MSS does eliminate from our mind any lingering doubt about the penmanship of the precious little note in the F II 9; MS Toulouse 248 also bears marginal notes of the same penmanship, and as the authenticity of our note in F II 9 is thus accredited, MS Toulouse 248 itself gains in merit as a text witness.

We may conclude by saying that Hiltalinger had the MSS Basel F II 9 and Toulouse 248 in his own hands — a fact which looms highly important for an edition based on so very few MSS.

between Hiltalinger and Michael in their Parisian Principia. The Principia, solemn University Acts which degenerated into mere show-pieces, were held at the beginning of each of the Four Books. The different Baccalarii attacked one another under the anonymity of 'Baccalarius S. Bernardi' 'Baccalarius S. Augustini' etc. and had to exchange their views in writing, a custom which at Hiltalinger's time was well established. — Hiltalinger left only a complete First Principium, and an incomplete Second Principium. The different «Baccalarii», unfortunately (!), cannot be identified with certainty in Hiltalinger's Principia.

III

Before examining Hiltalinger's Augustinian quotations, it is necessary to illustrate the new quoting technique of the 14th century with a few general examples. The reader will not fail to note that they are quite different from those of the 13th century.

In the *Secundum Principium* Hiltalinger demands from the *Baccalarius Praedicatorum* the chapter and verse of a quotation attributed to Aristotle:

« Peto quod mittat mihi dicta Philosophi in forma (i. e., literally) cum quotatione capituli quia multum dubito de dicto sicut iacet in forma (i. e., in the preacher's version) ».

In 10 RR r. 6 Hiltalinger quotes in a vein which betrays scholarly vanity:

« Quamvis autem Bradwardine et [Johannes de] Braculis saepe allegent Hermetem in libro De verbo aeterno, reperi tamen eadem dicta in libro Hermetis De helica ad Asclepium; et communiter omnia quae hi doctores dicunt ipsum dicere in libro De verbo aeterno, reperi in tertio libro ».

In 1 Sent. q. 27, where Thomas de Argentina supports a statement with « Aegidius 1 Sent. dist. 32 », Hiltalinger remarks:

« Perlegi Aegidium in ista distinctione 32 per totum nec possum invenire quod hic doctor [Argentinus] dicit ».

In 10 RR r. 7 Hiltalinger shows his erudition in the casual manner which is typical of him:

« Aliter habet dicere Haston ³⁰) in materia ista sicut patet in [suo] articulo 1 qui secundum meum librum est [articulus] 2: Utrum inter 'necesse esse' et 'impossibile esse' mediet 'possibile esse' ».

³⁰) *Nicolaus de Aston*, O. Min., famous in the 14th century for his '*Achilles Astensis*', i. e., an '*argumentum* invincibile et *insolubile*' for God's existence, left us 12 *Quaestiones* which on account of many cross-references purport to be a complete *Lectura*. The « *articulus 1 = 2* » is *quaestio 7* in MS Oriel 15 f. 217r. — The 12 *Quaestiones* did not fill the reading requirements of a whole year: on 12 days, therefore, Nicholas exhibited his dazzling 'logicistic' fireworks before an admiring audience; on the other days he must have read 'Good old Scotus'.
* It is hardly necessary to say explicitly that '*Achilles Astensis*' is not a person although this 'literary ghost' [Stegmüller's witty reaction] has already started to haunt the indices of recent books.

An apt demonstration of positive-minded erudition is seen in 10 RR r. 8 in the *Notabile* 8: « *Immo de facto sic ponitur esse per S. Thomam parte 1 q. 25 art. []. Et recitat Adam in Prologo, dubio 8 quaestionis* ». The number of the article was missing in Adam, according to my three MSS; however, Hiltalinger left a blank space [] to supply the number at a later date. Then, toward the end of *Notabile* 9, Hiltalinger in a new stratification communicates the results of his research: « *Tamen nota; dictum S. Thomae sic quotatur in Adam. Sed reperio ipsum hoc dicentem Parte 1 q. 85 art. 4* » (where the passage is actually found today).

This is of capital importance also in the Alfonsus Vargas edition of 1490 (reprint 1952). When the edition omits a chapter number many of the Alfonsus MSS leave a blank for the missing number. This blank seems to prove more than anything else that authors like Alfonsus felt it an obligation to supply missing numbers at a later date. These blanks are mute testimony to the positive-mindedness of the 14th century despite the fact that human frailty and pitiful library conditions made perfection impossible in the Middle Ages.

Others besides Hiltalinger were concerned with the accuracy of their documentation. Thus Conradus de Ebraco, O. Cist., sharply defends his accurate quoting of the *Articuli Parisienses* against Johannes de Braculis (Cln 27 034 f. 66^r). Conrad had quoted:

« Art. 8: 'Quod qui habet meliora naturalia, de necessitate habebit maiorem gratiam et gloriam, error' ».

Against J. de Braculis he shows that an « Art. 8 » is really found among a group of « *Articuli reperti in Scriptis quibusdam erroneis ut solent a quibusdam intitulari* ». He indicates the « Art. 1 » of this group³¹⁾ as

'Quod divina essentia in se nec ab angelis videtur (f. 66^v) nec videbitur'.

³¹⁾ Such a little group of « 11 Articuli » exists, in the old Lombardus edition 'AD 1513 apud Lodovicum Hornken Agripensem', on the last flyleaves [« P »]: « *condemnati ab episcopo Parisiensi et Magistris theologiae Regentibus Parisius AD MCCCXL [?] in octava Epiphaniae Domini* ». I think it is valuable information to know that condemnations could cover anonymous groups of writings. Perhaps Johannes de Ripa was condemned this way? (see footnote 20).

In a recent study on Hugolinus by Adolar Zumkeller ³²⁾, O. E. S. A., we have a fine example which illustrates Hugolin's attitude. During a discussion with the *Baccalarius Minorum* in the *Tertium Principium*, Hugolin had been reproved for quoting incorrectly. His reaction was short and definite:

« Iste Pater [O. Min.] dicit quod verba allegata [En. in] Psal. 58 non sunt ibi nec illud Augustini [12 De civitate dei cap. 9] est in isto capitulo sed in capitulo 10. Respondeo: Videat clarius quia ita inveniet».

The 14th century theologians sometimes manifested outright jealousy in regard to quotations which they claimed as their own discovery. Johannes de Ripa reminds Ascensius de S. Columba very firmly that certain 'Lux-quotations' from St. Augustine were first discovered by himself. Because the text is somewhat scrambled, I here give the text according to three MSS (viz., Vat. lat. 981 f. 64^r; Pal. lat. 566 f. 299^v-300^r; Arch. S. Pietro G 37 f. 89^v):

« Quod vero dicit [Ascensius] adversarios fuisse coactos per lucem intelligere beatitudinem formalem, quia me hic vocat adversarium, falsum dicit; nam nec fui coactus cum antequam ipse de ista materia somniaret, ipsam in *Lectura Sententiarum tractaverim et communicaverim eodem anno* (!) ³³⁾ in scriptis ex quibus quia pervenerunt ad ipsum, hausit materiam respiciendi istos Augustini processus nec... ».

Any rediscovered theological work of the past was quoted by these 14th century theologians to such an extent that posterity should find no excuse for being ignorant of its first 'rediscoverer'. As examples we find that Ripa exploits to the very limit an opusculum of Anselm ³⁴⁾; Bradwardine an opusculum of Hermes; and Hiltalinger some small treatises of Alanus and Alexander.

³²⁾ cf. Adolar ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto über Urstand u. Erbsünde*; offprint (from *Augustiniana* 1953, 4) [Leuven 1953] 67.

³³⁾ See footnote 20.

³⁴⁾ cf. A. COMBES, *Un inédit de S. Anselme d'après J. de Ripa* (Paris 1944), in: *Etudes Gilson* XXXIV.

IV

Let us now make a study of the new quoting technique of the 14th century in Hiltalinger's Augustinian quotations. Of course, we do not claim that each of these 800-1000 quotations prove a personal acquaintance with the sources. That would be a far too optimistic evaluation.

1. *Stock Quotations.*

First of all, there was then as now a stock of Augustinian quotations which, like so many theological proverbs, passed from one generation to the next. They are also found in Hiltalinger where they stand out because of their colorless, vague or incorrect connotations.

In 1 Sent. q. 2, and again in 3 Sent. q. 11, Hiltalinger quotes: « *Cetera potest homo nolens, credere nonnisi volens* » — once under the name of « Augustine » and in the other instance merely with the vague indication « *in quadam Homilia super Johannem* »³⁵). It is taken from Augustine's In Jo. Ev. tract. 26 (Pl 35: 1607), had already been vaguely alluded to in Lombard II n. 234, and passed from scholastic to scholastic.

We find another example in Hiltalinger's 1 Sent. q. 36: « *Prima veritate quae deus est vera sunt omnia* ». Both Hiltalinger and Hugolin cite as source « *Super psalmum 3* ». Actually it is 83 QQ q. 1 (Pl 40: 11), and occurs in Lombard³⁶) I n. 426: « *Omne verum a veritate est verum; est autem veritas deus* ». In the original text of Augustine there are three or four lines inserted between the two short sentences of Lombard. As the original was not consulted, the theological tradition recast the two sentences of Lombard into one: « *Prima veritate quae deus est vera sunt omnia* ».

In all fairness to Hiltalinger it must be admitted that the

³⁵) This quotation is also found in *Hugolinus* who is much more exact in supplying the source; twice he gives the reference « *Super Johannem hom. 27* »; cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugolin v. Orvieto* (Würzburg 1941) 357 and 363.

³⁶) Lombard's vague if correct reference « *in libro 83 QQ* » underwent a curious change at the hands of the copyists: « 83 » became « Sr » [super] and « qq » became « ps » [ps. 3?]. — The Augustinian *Angelus Dobelin* has the correct reference « 83 QQ q. 1 » but the same wrong text; « *Omne verum veritate prima est verum* »; cf. MS Jena Univ. El. Fol. 47 f. 6^r.

colorless and obscure quotations are an insignificant fraction of the large number of Augustinian *dicta* he quotes. Some quotations seem vaguer than they are. When Hiltalinger I Sent. q. 2 alleges Augustine « *in multis locis* » for the statement: « *Omne quod est, est deus vel creatura* », he has in mind the many beautiful *apophthegmata* of the *Milleloquium, vocabulo* « *Esse Ens Essentia* » I (1672) 389 sq. Or when, at the end of I Sent. q. 13, he defends himself against the charge of being a « *contemptor doctrinae Augustini* », he shows his acquaintance with Augustine by supporting the criticized doctrine with: « 15 De trinitate cap. 27 de magnis circa finem cap. 79 de parvis... in fine illius parvi capituli... Et subdit infra cap. 80 de parvis... ».

2. Overt Indirect Quotations.

Among the 800-1000 Augustinian quotations in Hiltalinger's works, about 200 are marked « *secundum allegationem* » of other authors ³⁷). They are accredited to:

Peter Lombard over 70 times ;

James of Viterbo, Thomas of Strasbourg, Gregory of Rimini, Alfonse of Toledo, Bonsimilant and John Romani (all Augustinians) over 20 times ;

Giles of Rome, 17 times ;

Adam, Alanus, Armacanus, Astensis Aureolus, Brinkil, ' Bartholomaeus de Castellione ', Climenton (Richard of Chillington), 17 times ;

Henry of Ghent, 6 times ;

Hugolin, 16 times ;

Johannes de Marchia, Johannes de Calore, Scotus, John XXII and Benedict XII about 25 times ;

Klenkok and Bradwardine about 20 times ;

Canon Law about 7 times ; and

St. Thomas, 5 times.

We see, therefore, that Hiltalinger feels obliged by a then common standard of literary honesty not to claim any merit for some 200 quotations which are not the result of his own research. It may safely be assumed that about 200 more Augustinian quota-

³⁷) It was not uncommon for scholastics to quote from secondary sources; cf. Hiltalinger 10 RR r. 6: « Patet per Doctorem Subtilem lib. 2 q. 1, ubi tria vituperat quae ponit idem Doctor [Sollemnis] 6 Quol. q. 3 diffuse quorum primum — secundum recitationem Doctoris Subtilis... — ».

tions were taken from other scholastics because many of them occur close to texts which are selected from authors famous for their Augustinianism. As Hiltalinger expected his readers to consult the quoted scholastics, he knew that these untagged indirect Augustinian quotations would not go to his own credit.

There are various reasons for indirect quoting. In the case of Peter Lombard and other popular works it was accessibility which justified this method. The medieval student had no Migne on his shelf. If he was to love Augustine he had first to acquire a taste for the Augustinian texts within his reach. Since Lombard was so easily accessible, he could lead the beginner to the less accessible Augustinian original.

Another reason rose very naturally from the interpretation of Augustinian texts. Other scholastics had interpreted famous quotations from Augustine; if Hiltalinger did not agree with them, or if their authority was great enough to lend support to his own explanation, they had to be cited by chapter and verse.

Sometimes Hiltalinger quotes Augustine indirectly only to prove that he went directly to the sources. A telling example is found in his *Decem Responsiones* (10 RR r. 6, shortly before concl. 1):

« Patet hoc per Augustinum 5 De trinitate cap. 17 quia sicut Pater et Filius sunt unum principium Spiritus Sancti, sic omnes tres personae sunt unum principium creaturae — sicut ponit Doctor Subtilis libro 2 q. 1 in fine art. 2 — ... Sciat tamen lector quod illa verba Augustini quae recitat Scotus non reperi ubi est dictum. Nam totus liber 5 non plura quam 16 capitula habet secundum libros quos vidi; et in cap. 17 de parvis nulla fit mentio de his quae possent ad istud propositum esse. Habentur plura pro his cap. 13 et 14 de magnis, et signanter 33 de parvis, quod est circa finem 14 de magnis » (cf. PL 42: 921).

Another example is found at the end of 10 RR r. 6, Notabile 8, where Hiltalinger quotes three passages of Augustine on Aeternitas. Although the source is not indicated these three are taken from the *Milleloquium*. Then he continues:

Ex his sequitur primo quod anni dei qui non transeunt, idest aeternitas dei, non aliud sunt quam essentia dei, sicut aeternitas dei ipsa substantia dei est, nihil habens mutabile. Verba sunt Magistri lib. 1 dist. 19 cap. 2 (l n. 169) et originaliter sumuntur ab Augustino 7 Confessionum, ubi tractat illud Psal. (101, 25) ' In

generatione et generatione anni tui', secundum quotationem Magistri ».

Hiltalinger must have been unsuccessful in tracing this last quotation for reasons shown by the Quaracchi edition of Lombard (I n. 169). Hiltalinger continues:

« Bradwardine lib. 1 parte 34 cap. 1 dicit esse illa verba Augustini super Psal. 101 serm. 2 et 1 Confess. cap. 6 ».

Apparently he was satisfied with the reference « Psal. 101 serm. 2 » because the *Milleloquium* vocabulo « Aeternitas » lists « Psal. 101 serm. 2 » immediately after the other three *dicta* which Hiltalinger quoted as mentioned above. He also checked the reference « 1 Confess. cap. 6 » but found there only the Psalm quotation (101, 28): 'Anni tui non deficient' (PL 32: 665). We know of this check-up because shortly afterwards in the same *Notabile* 8 he uses a beautiful passage from 1 Confess. cap. 6 (PL 32:664).

3. Bi-serial Quotations.

In some works of St. Augustine, especially in the *De trinitate*, and to a lesser degree in other books such as *De civitate dei*, *De libero arbitrio*, and *De Genesi ad litteram*, we find two 'capitulations' quoted side by side, e. g., « cap. ... de magnis et cap. ... de parvis » or either of the two alone, i. e., « cap. ... de magnis » or « cap. ... de parvis ». The 'capitulation' « de magnis » on the whole corresponds to the 'capitulation' of Migne; such however is not the case when we meet the « cap. ... de parvis »³⁸).

Hiltalinger uses this meticulous manner of double citation almost exclusively when taking a text from the *De trinitate*. In the case of the *De civitate dei* only ten such cases have come to my attention while in *De trinitate* the bi-serial system occurs 60 times,

³⁸) The 'capitulation': « de parvis » never reached the stage of codification although it started early; cf. Scotus, Quodl. q. 8 (Vivès XXVI [1895] 343 sq.). — I have not seen the 'editio princeps' of St. Augustine nor the medieval 'Corpus' of St. Augustine (Troyes 40; *Cat. gén. des MSS... des Dep.* II [1885] 33-42). cf. J. DE GHELLINCK, *La prem. éd. imprimée... S. Aug.*, in: *Misc. J. Gessler* I (1948) 530-547. GHELLINCK, *Une... collection médiévale... S. Aug.*, in: *Liber Floridus. Festschrift P. Lehmann* (St. Ottilien 1950) 63-82. GHELLINCK, *Patristique et MA*, III (1948) 342.

viz., 28 times in Hiltalinger's First Book, 19 times in the *Decem Responsiones*, 10 times in the unfinished *Vesperiae* ³⁹).

Ignoring the instances of single quotation « de parvis » and the very few cases when « de magnis » is just added to our vulgate chapters, a few examples of the bi-serial system may be cited. They are taken from the *Decem Responsiones* (10 RR r. 6) where we find Hiltalinger admitting that the edited work greatly differs from the actual delivery of the *Responsio*.

In regard to Spiritus Sanctus = Donum, Hiltalinger says:

« Patet per Augustinum 4 De trinitate cap. 52 de parvis et 20 de magnis; vel secundum alios libros 21 de magnis et 27 et 28 de parvis ⁴⁰). Item 15 De trinitate cap. 17 de magnis et 51 et 52 de parvis: 'Non frustra in hac trinitate non dicitur Verbum nisi Filius, nec Donum dei nisi Spiritus Sanctus'. Istam partem deduxi l Sententiarum dist. 18 concl. 1; et ponit eam Magister ibidem in textu pluribus capitulis ».

This precise 'capitulation' could not have been gleaned from the Magister (l. nn. 109 and 161) because his text does not contain it.

Our next example is found in a discussion on eternity (10 RR r. 6):

« Probabitur amplius per Augustinum 4 De trinitate cap. 18 de magnis, vel 19 secundum alios, sed 39 de parvis ⁴¹): 'Non enim proprie, inquit, vocatur aeternum quod aliqua ex parte mutatur; inquantum igitur mutabiles sumus in tantum ab aeternitate distamus'. Item in fine illius 4 < De trinitate cap. 18 > et est 42 de parvis: 'Vera incommutabilitas ipsa est aeternitas' (PL 42: 904 and 905).

³⁹) As a young Baccalarius did not have sufficient time to check the primary sources, we may assume that these 'bi-serial quotations' were inserted prior to publication. This would give us another criterion for establishing the order in which Hiltalinger's works were published: the *In Primum* and the *Decem Responsiones* were first overhauled; then the *In Quartum* and the *In Secundum*, finally the *In Tertium* (the shortest of all, with traces of incomplete editing). The *Vesperiae* were never finished; the *Quolibetum* and the *Lectura super Epistolam* were never released to the public. — The fact that the unfinished *Vesperiae* are replete with 'bi-serial quotations', may easily be explained by the ambition of a new Magister who wanted to show his erudition before the whole University.

⁴⁰) If the numbers « 52 de parvis », « 27 et 28 de parvis », and « 39 de parvis », are correct we are here confronted with three different 'small capitulations'; but we have no way of verifying it.

⁴¹) See footnote 40.

The Augustinian *dicta* are not found in Lombard, nor under the *vocabulum* Aeternitas in the Milleloquium. This surprisingly scrupulous manner of quoting Augustine has nothing to do with an Augustinian's love for the founder of his Order: it is rather a characteristic of many 14th century theologians. The same scrupulosity can be noticed in Hiltalinger when he quotes other authors, and although contemporaries rival with him, he seems one of the outstanding 'quoters' of this positive-minded century.

4. Uncodified Capitulations.

The 'capitulation' of Augustine's major works was approaching the stage of codification by 1350. Bartholomew Carusi of Urbino has some valuable remarks about this in the introduction to his *Milleloquium* [I (1672) f. a: 4^v]:

« Liber de academicis: Omnes < libros tres > sine capitulis reperi.

Liber de origine animae: Allegavi eum indistincte, non per capitula, quia sic reperi.

Liber de baptismo parvulorum: Non quotavi in allegando capitula quia celeriter perlegi et sine capitulis reperi.

Liber de unico baptismo... contra Petilianum: Indistincte allegavi ut reperi.

Liber de cura pro mortuis agenda: Sine capitibus eum reperi et indistinctum.

Liber de vera et falsa poenitentia: Satis est magnus et per plura capitula distinctus.

Liber quaestionum ad Orosium: Ego cursim perlegens non bene feci indistincte allegando.

Liber super totum Evangelium Joannis scriptus per Tractatus sive Sermones: Quod volumen apud aliquos in duas partes dividitur, credo magnitudinis causa, et secunda pars incipit in Tractatu XLVIII super illud: 'Ante festum Paschae'. Nec hoc mirandum quia etiam reperi opus super Psalterium in tres partes divisum.

Liber super epistolam ad Galatas: Inadvertens fui non allegando ⁴²⁾ distincte hunc librum; sed antiquitas libri et celeritas perlegendi fuit in < mihi ? > causa ».

⁴²⁾ Bartholomew Carusi realizes that the authenticity of an Augustinian work must be supported by the *Retractationes*, and also that the evaluation of a particular text witness must be founded on the « antiquitas » of the manuscript. He often mentions the antiquity of his MSS in the Index Librorum [cf. *Milleloquium* I (1672) f. e: 1^r]: « Liber de Duodecim Gradibus abusionum. Et etiam dubium est utrum sit Augustini, quia non nominatur in libro *Retractationum* et aliqui

While, generally speaking, the major works used by the 14th century theologians already had a codified 'capitulation', it is true that 'fluctuations'⁴³⁾ are noticeable in the Augustinian quotations of Hiltalinger, v. g.:

1 Sent. q. 2: De fide [doctrina] christiana cap. 5 secundum unam quotationem, vel capitulo ultimo secundum aliam.

1 Sent. q. 6: 15 De trinitate cap. 14 in fine, vel secundum aliam allegationem cap. 15 in principio.

1 Sent. q. 26: 83 QQ q. 20, vel 25 secundum alios.

2 Sent. q. 28: 19 De civitate dei cap. 23 in fine secundum unam quotationem, vel cap. 24 in principio secundum aliam.

10 RR r. 2: 1 De trinitate cap. 13 secundum aliam (!) quotationem.

10 RR r. 5: 3 De libero arbitrio cap. 23 [c. 15; PL 32: 1293].

10 RR r. 6: 3 De libero arbitrio cap. 23, vel 26 secundum aliam allegationem [c. 15; PL 32: 1293].

10 RR r. 8: 5 Super Genesim cap. 12 [22 ?], vel 24.

5. Personal Acquaintance with Augustinian Originals.

According to the preceding pages one might set the number of Hiltalinger's direct quotations at 400-500; yet a lower number would come closer to the truth. Each quotation would have to be

appropriant Cypriano; ego tamen reperi in antiquo originali intitulatum Augustino». *Ibid.* f. e: 4^v «*Liber de Symbolo ad Laurentium*. Non nominatur in libro Retractationum, nonnulli ascribunt Hieronymo; ego tamen reperi in antiquo volumine intitulari Augustino, sed anceps de vero pauca excerpsi de ipso». ** There are many remarks in the Introduction of Bartholomew which have interested the patrologists e. g. *ibid.* f. e: 1^r «*Liber Enchiridii*. Unde in Episcopatu Bononiensi, argenteis et aureis literis scriptum reperi». Or the introductory lines of the *Tabula Sermonum* (*ibid.* f. i: 1^v) which exalt the Sermon collection of *Dominus Robertus Cancellarius Parisiensis*. It seems that Bartholomew was the first to have attempted a 'patrological' treatise on Augustine's works.

⁴³⁾ Some fluctuations have been observed and recorded by the Maurini-Migne edition; cf. PL 40: 231: «[Enchiridion] in scriptis codicibus 'capitulationes' et sectiones non easdem sortitum est. In quibusdam 134, aut 126, vel, ut in editis, 122; in aliis 71, in nonnullis 54 aut rariores, et in quibusdam nullas». Hiltalinger's 'capitulations' of the *Enchiridion* never agree with Migne's. — Some quotationes like Hiltalinger's (10 RR r. 7): «11 vel 12 De civitate cap. 15; perlegas totum caput quia reperies bona ibi ad propositum» do not indicate fluctuation of 'capitulation' but only show the erudition of Hiltalinger who could quote from memory in the lecture hall on the spur of the moment, and used every opportunity to encourage his students always to read the whole chapter when consulting the originals.

compared with the thousands of *apophthegmata* in the *Milleloquium*, in Lombard, in Canon Law, and in the more known theologians. Such a test is not only difficult but also inconclusive. The presence of an Augustinian *dictum* in the *Milleloquium* does not exclude the possibility of a personal approach to the sources — if general interest in the original sources is postulated or proven for the theology around 1350. I have made a file of all the *apophthegmata* in the *Milleloquium* and Peter Lombard, but not for Canon Law because Hiltalinger exploited it rather infrequently for his Augustinian quotations. Neither did I prepare a file for the *Glossa Ordinaria*.

6. The *Milleloquium*.

In the case of Peter Lombard my file is often conclusive, but the same cannot be said for the *Milleloquium*. I doubt that its use can be definitely proved more than twenty times. Hiltalinger quotes it by name four times: *vocabulo* Christiani, *vocabulo* Divitiae, *vocabulo* Lex Naturalis, *vocabulo* Assumptio. He also uses undoubtedly the *vocabulum* Caritas because a long series of quotations in his text is also found in the *vocabulum* Caritas of the *Milleloquium*. In one case he used a passage with many Augustinian quotations from Johannes de Braculis who had taken them from the *Milleloquium*, *vocabulo* Facies.

Only by a happy coincidence can one prove that a particular quotation comes from the *Milleloquium*, if, for instance, the quotation is the very first *apophthegma* under a *vocabulum* which is really descriptive and indicative, and easily leads to the quotation under discussion. But whoever is acquainted with the *Milleloquium* knows that the *vocabula* contain sometimes whole chapters of Augustinian works whose catalogization is not perfect ; for while richness of contents and clearness of indexing are mutually exclusive, the author of the *Milleloquium* preferred richness to clarity.

7. Proof of Personal Acquaintance with the Sources ?

Instead of indulging in a fruitless search for the extent of direct quoting it is more profitable to determine whether Hiltalinger took over indirect quotations without ever confronting them with the originals. In the preceding pages of this article we have already seen a number of examples which prove his conscientiousness to

consult the original whenever an indirect quotation had strange connotations. I want to indicate a few more, especially from the Third Book, because if a scholar can detect flaws in an indirect quotation at first sight — and does correct them by an examination of the originals — we have good reasons to suppose that he often went to his patristic library when he quoted in a manner which seems to show direct consultation of the primary sources.

In 10 RR r. 5 concl. 2 coroll. 3 Hiltalinger writes:

« Dictum legis naturae in suo proprio 'legali esse' est simpliciter invariabile. Patet corollarium ... per beatum Augustinum 9 De trinitate cap. 6 de magnis et 16 de parvis (PL 42: 966) ubi dicit: 'Viget et claret desuper iudicium veritatis ac sui iuris incorruptissimis regulis firmum est; et si corporalium imaginum quasi quodam nubilo subtexitur, non tamen involvitur atque confunditur'. Aliter et magis expresse notat auctoritatem praedicatam Milleloquium; sed non reperi omnia quae Milleloquium ponit, in textu <Augustini> »⁴⁴).

This example indicates that Hiltalinger went first to the *Milleloquium* to find a convenient passage about 'lex' under the properly descriptive *vocabulum* Lex Naturalis; surprised at some connotations of the *Milleloquium* text — which we can no longer verify — he went to the original, discarded the *Milleloquium* text in favor of the original one, but was scholarly enough to warn against the flaws of the *Milleloquium*. That he actually sought enlightenment in the sources, results from the 10 RR r. 6. Nota-

⁴⁴) cf. *Milleloquium* I (Brixen 1734) 1171; II (Paris 1672) 19, 2 D under the *vocabulum* «Lex naturalis». [The Brixen edition has numbered columns; the Paris edition has only numbered the pages each of which has two columns. The Brixen edition ends the first volume with the *vocabulum* «Luxuria», the Paris edition with the *vocabulum* «Juventus et Juvenis»]. — In our Paris edition, the Augustinian quotation under discussion appears as one complete *apophthegma* near the beginning of the *vocabulum* «Lex naturalis» [II (1672) 19, 2 D]; the *Milleloquium* and the Migne text do not show variants appreciable enough to warrant the high degree of surprise expressed by Hiltalinger. It may well be that our *Milleloquium* has undergone overzealous editing efforts. Hiltalinger's manual copy of the *De trinitate* cannot be blamed for the discrepancy because Hiltalinger quotes the same passage in the same words a second time (10 RR r. 6 notabile 2), this time in a much fuller context of 9 De trin. cap. 6.

bile 2 where our Augustinian *dictum* is preceded by a large section of 9 De trinitate cap. 6.

Another example of the conscientious use which Hiltalinger made of his secondary sources, I take from the *Vesperiae terminus* I consideratio 3 where Hiltalinger copies a group of Augustinian *dicta* from « Johannes de Braculis in suo tractatu De videndo deum cap. 7 », viz.: 22 De civitate [dei] cap. 32 ... Super Ps. 104, 4 ... 83 QQ q. 31 < 52 > ... Commentar. ad Fortunatum < Fortunatianum > [ep. 148, olim 111 ; PL 33: 622 sq.].

It is interesting that Johannes de Braculis got these quotations from the *Milleloquium, vocabulo* Facies [I (1672) 413, I C sq.] where the serial order is the following: 83 QQ q. 52 ... 22 De civitate cap. 29 ... En. in Ps. 104, 4 ; only the ep. 148 (olim 111) is missing.

When Hiltalinger copied the group of Augustinian *dicta* he saw immediately that the first quotation « 22 De civitate [dei] cap. 32 » could hardly be correct. Conscientiously he went to his library to solve the problem, and proudly communicated the result of his research:

« Sciendum tamen quod secundum libros quos vidi, 22 liber De civitate [dei] non habet nisi 30 capitula, et in 30 [capitulo] nihil dicitur de ista materia ; sed in 29 [capitulo] habetur (PL 41 : 797) : ' Facies autem dei manifestatio eius intelligenda est ' ».

8. Augustinian Quotations of Hiltalinger's *In Tertium*.

Of all the works which Hiltalinger published the *In Tertium* received least of his care and attention. The Third Book remained with a few exceptions just as the Baccalarius Hiltalinger read it to his students in Paris.

There are about 70 Augustinian quotations in this Third Book ; they are usually short, often indirect and seem to compare unfavorably with the wealth of Augustinian texts as contained in other works, esp. the *Decem Responsiones*. Now, if among these 70 unpretentious quotations we still detect a larger number that attest to the new historical attitude of the 14th century, we have a very good argument for our basic assumption ; because we then make only a minimum claim, supported by quotations which are less representative and below the average of quotations found in works like the *Decem Responsiones*.

As a matter of fact, about one half of these 70 Augustinian texts show signs of the new quoting habits. Eighteen among them, although taken over from Peter Lombard, indicate a 'capitulation' which is better than Lombard's:

3001 ⁴⁵⁾ Hiltalinger	3 Contra Maximinum c. 10 ; PL 42: 765.
Lombard III n. 55	« in libro contra Maximinum ».
3043 Hiltalinger	Enchiridion c. 36 [38] ; PL 40: 251.
Lombard III n. 18-20	Enchiridion c. 37 [39] ; PL 40: 252.
	« in Enchiridio ».
3099 Hiltalinger	Ad Dardanum ep. 44 [ep. 187 (57)] ; PL 33: 847.
Lombard III n. 80	« Ad Dardanum ».
3109 Hiltalinger	Enchiridion c. 36 [38] ; PL 40:251.
Lombard III n. 18	« in Enchiridio ».
3110 Hiltalinger	1 De trinitate c. 13 ; PL 42: 840.
Lombard III n. 47	« in libro De trinitate ».
3144 Hiltalinger	3 De trinitate c. 7 [8] ; PL 42: 876.
Lombard II n. 51	(No reference nearby).
3180 Hiltalinger	13 De trinitate c. 19 ; PL 42: 1033.
Lombard III n. 76	« Augustinus ».
3292 Hiltalinger	13 De trinitate c. 10 de magnis ; PL 42: 1024.
Lombard III n. 135	(No reference).
3323 Hiltalinger	In Jo. Evang. tr. 47 [n. 13] ; PL 35: 1740.
Lombard III n. 146	« Super Joannem ».
3325 Hiltalinger	12 Sup. Gen. ad litt. v. fn. [c. 35] ; PL 34: 483.
Lombard IV n. 440	(No reference).
3403 Hiltalinger	15 De trinitate c. 18 ; PL 42: 1082
3408	« Nullum est isto dei dono excellentius... [1083]. Sine caritate quippe

⁴⁵⁾ These four-figure numbers are the text numbers of my edition: Book 1 will have the numbers 0001-1999, Book 2: 2000-2999, Book 3: 3000 — ... For reference purposes I indicate the *last number* of each of the 19 Quaestiones Tertii: 3036 - 3068 - 3106 - 3137 - 3176 - 3213 - 3252 - 3288 - 3322 - 3356 - 3392 - 3430 - 3476 - 3503 - 3534 - 3564 - 3605 - 3641 - 3682.

- fides potest quidem esse sed non prodesse » cf. Lombard I n. 149 where only the first half is found under the quotation « 15 De trinitate ».
- 3433 Hiltalinger
Lombard III n. 215
In Ep. Jo. [tr. 8 n. 9] ; PL 35: 2041.
« Super Ep. Jo. ».
(But Hiltalinger refers to Decret. De paenit. Dist. 2 Depositum).
- 3451 Hiltalinger
(Lombard III n. 201)
I De doctrina christ. ult. med. [c. 27] ; PL 34: 29 ubi dicit ' Ille iuste et sancte vivit etc. < qui rerum integer aestimator est > '. This *incipit* of I De doctrina christ. c. 27 is the only sentence which Lombard [(III n. 201) ; no reference but « Augustinus »] omits in his famous passage on the order of charity. Yet Hiltalinger expects his students and readers to identify Lombard's famous passage by an *incipit* which Lombard omits and Hiltalinger only gets from the original: « Patet per Magistrum in distinctionibus istis ». — The two vague remarks « ultra medium » and « in distinctionibus istis » sound as if Hiltalinger quoted both Augustine and Lombard from memory in the lecture hall !
- 3481 Hiltalinger
Lombard II n. 241
2 De lib. arb. [c. 19] ; PL 32: 1268
« Virtutes igitur quibus recte vivitur etc. ».
I libro Retract.: « Virtutes quibus recte vivitur etc. ».
- 3504 Hiltalinger
Lombard I n. 149
15 De trinitate c. 18 ; PL 42: 1082.
« 15 De trinitate ».
- 3435 Hiltalinger
Lombard III n. 201
I De doctrina christ. c. 32 [c. 27] ; PL 34: 29.
« Augustinus ».
- 3540 Hiltalinger
Lombard III n. 192
I De doctrina christ. c. 26 [c. 22] ; PL 34: 27.
(No reference).

The above list creates the impression that Baccalarius Hiltalinger was so familiar with Augustinian sources that he could easily correct Lombard's references; but there remains the possibility that the 14th century text of Lombard was already well equipped with exact Augustinian 'capitulations'. This would give less credit to Hiltalinger, but pay all the more tribute to an entire generation of 14th century theologians. I am inclined to accept this possibility as a probability.

The Fathers of Quaracchi have given us a splendid edition of Lombard, based on the oldest manuscripts, but our problem will not be solved until we can determine just how well documented the 14th century Lombard appeared. Only then can we gauge the personal merit of a 14th century theologian who *seems* to improve Lombard's quotations.

The theory that the 14th century Lombard had already good text verifications, is supported by some facts. In his *Expositio Litteralis*, e. g., Johannes Klenkok O. E. S. A. quotes exactly what Lombard quotes but vaguely. In one place, at least, Klenkok verified a Lombard text better than the Quaracchi edition L: III n. 9:

« Item in libro De trinitate: 'Non esset Dei hominumque mediator, nisi esset idem Deus, idem homo, in utroque unus et verus, quam servilem formam, a solo Filio susceptam, tota Trinitas, cuius una est voluntas et operatio, fecit. Non autem in utero Virginis prius caro suscepta est, et postmodum divinitas venit in carnem, sed mox ut Verbum venit in uterum, servata veritate propriae naturae, factum est caro et perfectus est homo, id est, in veritate carnis et animae natus est ».

In regard to this passage Klenkok says in his *Expositio litteralis* ⁴⁶⁾:

« Auctoritas Augustini non invenitur in libro De trinitate, sed invenitur lib. 2 Sententiarum Hugonis cap. 5 ».

The whole passage is actually found in Hugo's *Summa Sententiarum*, tract. 1 cap. 16 (PL 176: 72). The fact that the 'capitulation' of Klenkok does not correspond to our modern one, does not diminish the merit of his erudition. While the Quaracchi Fathers

⁴⁶⁾ cf. MS Klosterneuburg 304 f. 135^v and MS Siena G V 16 f. 36^v. — On Klenkok, Johannes de Braculis, Angelus Dobelin cf. my forthcoming article: Teólogos Agustinos alemanes del siglo XIV, *Archivo Agustiniiano*.

quote Hugo of St. Victor for Lombard III n. 10, they do not remit to Hugo in L: III n. 9.

In addition to Klenkok other scholastics corrected and improved Lombard's references; e. g., Richardus Chillington in his *Quaestiones theologicae* ⁴⁷⁾ very casually corrects our Lombard:

« Item in *Enchiridio* cap. 6 [c. 9], et allegat Magister... ». He refers to L: I n. 52 where Lombard does not pretend to quote the *Enchiridion* but, erroneously, the « *De fide ad Petrum in expositione Symboli* ».

One last example of a 14th century documentation of Lombard's text; surprisingly it comes from Facinus de Ast, O. E. S. A., who otherwise is more interested in the speculative problems, raised by the *Quidam* [Johannes de Ripa] and by many other *Quidam*. A few times, however, he identifies vague quotations of Lombard. The outstanding instance occurs in the *In Tertium* of Facinus ⁴⁸⁾:

« Item Ad Rom. 8, 3 ' Misit Filium suum < in similitudinem carnis peccati > Glossa; et est sumpta ab Augustino de verbis Apostoli, et eam de verbo ad verbum allegat Magister 3 Sen. dist. 3 cap. 3: ' Contracta non est de carne peccatrice sed in similitudine eius per passibilitatem et mortalitatem et alios defectus ' « Cetera vero [hominum] omnis caro peccati est; sola istius non est caro peccati quia non eum mater concupiscentia < sed gratia concepti >. Habet tamen similitudinem carnis peccati ».

The Lombard text (L: III n. 14) gives not the faintest hint of quoting from Augustine nor have the Quaracchi Fathers tracked down this implicit quotation; but as a matter of fact, three or four lines of the Quaracchi edition are literally taken from Augustine's Sermo 152 ([n. 8]; PL 38: 823) where Augustine speaks « de verbis Apostoli », namely Rom. 8, 1-4.

If it were definitely established one day that the Lombard text of the 14th century incorporated many corrected references, contributed one by one in slow and patient research, we would have to consider such a proof as bearing upon the historical attitude of several scholastic generations.

Among the 70 Augustinian quotations in Hiltalinger's Third

⁴⁷⁾ cf. Vat. lat. 4353 f. 50^r.

⁴⁸⁾ cf. Facinus de Ast, *In Tertium* q. 6; MS Erfurt Ampl. 2^o 115 f. 176^v and MS Ottob. lat. 446 f. 116^r sq.

Book there are eight which may be considered as resulting from Hiltalinger's personal research in the sources;

- 3044 2 De trinitate cap. 10 ; PL 42: 855-58.
 3357 De spiritu et littera ad Marcellinum prope finem ([c. 34] ; PL 44: 240. The « finis » would be c. 36). This quotation is not in Lombard, nor in the Milleloquium ; Hugolinus ⁴⁹⁾ has it, but without reference.
 3383 15 De trinitate cap. 4 de magnis et 15 de parvis (PL 42: 1061). Although the Milleloquium has this *dictum* (I [1672] 288, I B; first apophthegma, under the obvious vocabulum « Deus ») we cannot credit the Milleloquium for the bi-serial capitulation.
 3419 Enchiridion cc. 6, 7, 11 [cc. 4-5] ; PL 40: 232-233. Not in L nor in M.
 3424 De bono [dono] perseverantiae cap. 19 ; PL 45: 1024 ; also quoted by 10 RR r. 5.
 3481 2 De civitate dei cap. 21 ; PL 41: 68 (« Forte nec tunc [fuit] viva moribus sed picta coloribus »). Not in L nor in M.
 3482 1 De moribus ecclesiae cap. 14 [cc. 14-15] ; PL 32: 1321-22. The quotation is taken from St. Thomas who incorrectly refers to « Augustinus in quadam epistula ». Cf. Thomas I II q. 65 art. 3.
 3540 10 De civitate dei cap. 2 [c. 3 n. 2, olim c. 4] ; PL 41: 280 (« Ipse enim fons nostrae beatitudinis, ipse omnis appetitionis est finis »). The M has this passage where no one would normally search for it, viz., II (1672) 7, I E *vocabulo* « Latria ».

Of the remaining 44 Augustinian quotations seven are probably direct ones, some are proverbial commonplaces, three are neither from Augustine nor Ps-Augustine. About five are from the *Glossa Ordinaria*, two are from Richard Chillington ⁵⁰⁾, five are from Hugolinus ⁵¹⁾.

One is undoubtedly from the *Milleloquium*: « Augustinus lib. Meditationum cap. 21 [27] » (cf. II (1672) 571, 2 B). These spurious Meditationes are not in the Maurini edition, nor are they mentioned in the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* ; Bartholomaeus de Urbinio (Index Librorum ; I [1672] f. e: 1^v) notes:

« Alicubi dicitur '2 liber Soliloquiorum ad deum' de quo Bernardus et Anselmus multa in suos [!] etiam quoad literam

⁴⁹⁾ cf. A. ZUMKELLER, *Hugol. v. Orvieto* (Würzburg 1941) 359.

⁵⁰⁾ cf. MS Bruges 503 f. 103^r and 105^r.

⁵¹⁾ cf. MS Paris Nat. lat. 14559 ff. 162^r, 196^v, 197^r.

transtulerunt. Satis est magnus et 39 capitula distincta continet; et de poenis inferni diffuse pertractat. De quo in libro Retractationum nulla fit mentio. Incipit: 'Eia nunc, homuncio, fuge paululum occupationes tuas' ». (The Milleloquium contains around 50 quotations of this devotional treatise).

After this rapid examination of the Augustinian quotations which Hiltalinger incorporated in his Third Book, we may specify the minimum claim that about one fourth perhaps one third of Augustinian quotations by authors like Hiltalinger, show connotations of the new quoting attitude of the 14th century.

Considering this fact in connection with the two others which we alleged at the beginning of this article, one has reasons to assume that no appraisal of the 14th century theology is complete, or even just, without properly evaluating this incipient historical consciousness which — if fully developed — could have forestalled attacks against the medieval church in the name of a forgotten or neglected tradition.

Damasus TRAPP, O. E. S. A.