

Guillelmi de Villana Cremonensis O.S.A. Tractatus cuius titulus Reprobatio errorum, quem edendum curavit Darach MAC FHIONNBHAIRR (Corpus Scriptorum Augustinianorum). Roma, Augustinianum, 1977, xiv-116 pp.

Each new edition marks a real milestone in the history of medieval thought. We have all reasons to be grateful to Darach Mac Fhionnbhairr for having given to us a modern edition of William of Villana's *Reprobatio errorum* because one can never understand certain facets of the church-state relationship without knowing about the collision course maintained so long by the claimants of the Two Swords be they ecclesiastical or imperial.

The typographical dress of the little edition is very dignified, the latinity of the text has been treated with great care.

There is some window dressing in the apparatus variantium where codex B and codex C are given more credit than they deserve, also in the apparatus fontium where references from one textline to a preceding one or a following one are, time and again, found less reliable, in the index generalis where enumerations of mere logicalia (principale 1^m, 2^m, 3^m...) do not appear very helpful.

The index rerum, the most important one, turns out to be a good key to the text even though all legitimate desiderata (how could they) are not found therein. So many different terms may be absent from a selective index without impairing it but even a selective index must be true to itself. As the term 'ordo' naturally cannot be dispensed within our index, and as 'ordo' means so many things (ordo sacramentalis = sacramentum, ordo iurisdictionis = iurisdictio, ordo naturalis = natura, ordo ad = relatio) it must be decided which 'ordo' we refer to. In the index of our edition we read «ordo possidentium res temporales page 7». There on page 7, however, we find something totally different, namely that legitimacy of earthly possessions depends «ex ordine... ad deum» i.e. relationship to God makes possessing either legitimate or illegitimate (a quite revolutionary idea of the 14th century!).

The editor relies on German interpunction, that is, only on commas and periods; there is never a semicolon or colon to be seen, a feat which the most authoritative and international latin text of today, the New Roman Breviary or Liturgia Horarum did not even dare to attempt. In this edition the German comma is used to offset many clauses, relative or otherwise, which need no offsetting; a few times the editor even separates main clauses with a mere comma (cf q 1, 963 : sub eius dominio sunt, modo dico, quod... similarly in q 1, 455). The very opposite happens when the editor tears a «modo... modo» asunder with the interpunction mark of a period (ed q 1, 250 wrongly : ... ut modo sint istius. Modo autem alterius semper sunt obligatae... instead of marking rightly : ... ut modo sint istius, modo alterius, semper sunt obligatae...). Even the question mark is made

to play the part of a comma in this edition (ed q 1, 83-86: Cum quaeritur, an...? id est, an...? Et cum quaeritur, an...? intelligi debet... where a Roman reader might rightly expect: Cum quaeritur, an... id est an..., et cum quaeritur, an..., intelligi debet...).

Wisely the editor refrains from inserting too many more or less arbitrary headlines into his text but in q 1 after the lines 37bis-83 (= definition of 'ecclesia') a new alignment could have marked off the lines 83-94 (= definition of 'bona ecclesiae'). With similar visual helps the text certainly would have become more readable.

In regard to the text constitution only a few remarks. If codex B and codex C are identical to codex A, why should variants from B and C encumber the apparatus like so many dead cinders that cannot give light or warmth? If as the editor says on page xi: « The first-hand derivation of BC from A is reenforced by the inclusion in these manuscripts of line-terminal and other deleted words and letters found in A », B and C should have been given little importance.

The text as presented in this edition seems to be a slavish replica of codex A, even when A demands a faith which is absurd. On the other hand it can hardly meet with approval when the editor corrects real or apparent absurdities with his own conjectures, ignoring the manuscripts.

D and E, the other two manuscripts, in a number of instances could have offered their help for constituting the final text. Unfortunately, the editor thought them to be of no value, because supposedly poor direct copies of codex A, if I understand his vague words correctly: « The interpretation difficulties found in the later manuscripts D and E leave no doubt as to their immediate source in A » (p. xi). D and E are admittedly late copies but copies that were made by curial hands and apparently for curial purposes. Their presence in a Roman library near codex A need not imply necessarily mutual influence. I made a cursory spicilegium dubiorum meorum while going over the editor's apparatus and found among my ca. 60 dubia at least some variants in D or E which could never have been derived directly from codex A. D and E seem to have a curial cautiousness in their way of expression. The clause 'sibi in omnibus oboedire' printed in this edition, reads in D and E 'suis monitionibus oboedire'; the harsh 'falsum' of the printed text becomes 'frivolum' in the variants of codex E, and this some five times; D also smooths the 'pontificalis potestas' into a 'pontificalis dignitas'. As E rather consistently reads 'verus' instead of the printed 'unus', and likewise 'universaliter' instead of the editor's 'naturaliter', one might think that E was copied from an old 14th century manuscript.

What I have jotted down in the following spicilegium should be accepted with the necessary caution as I have not had the privilege of looking into the manuscripts themselves.

Spicilegium dubiorum

With indication of Quaestio (= q)
and numbered textline of edition (= ed)

- q 1, 14 ed didragma (why not didrachma as in Mt 17, 23?). Why in q 3, 367 dyadochis instead of the normal diadochis?
- q 1, 32 ed idololatrae; why then in q 1, 1121 idolatizare?
- q 1, 31bis ed falsum; E frivolum just like in q 1, 10 and in q 1, 619 and in q 1, 998 and in q 1, 1000
- q 1, 41 ed unita fide; D unita fide una
- q 1, 100 ed dominus omnium naturaliter; E dominus omnium universaliter
- q 1, 167 ed potestas ordinis; dogmatically correcter ABCD potestas ordinis cum effectu
- q 1, 219-221 ed Sic potestas terrena, qua immediate reguntur temporalia, reservatur in spirituali; ABCE Sic potestas terrena, qua immediate reguntur, temporalia reservantur in spirituali
- q 1, 251 ed ut modo sint istius. Modo autem alterius semper sunt; ought to be ut modo sint istius, modo autem alterius, semper sunt... Similar desperate interpunctuations do not help the reader cf q 1, 455 and q 1, 963
- q 1, 255 ed verus; E unus
- q 1, 282 ed verus; E unus
- q 1, 286 ed ad forum privatum; in parallel context q 1, 372 we read forum poenitientiale
- q 1, 430 ed discernunt; E decernunt
- q 1, 455 ed super rem superius positam, modo constat ought to be super rem superius positam. Modo constat
- q 1, 472-473 ed fidelibus terrena possidere conceduntur; D and E rightly fidelibus terrena possidere conceditur
- q 1, 564 ed singulari bona; D rightly singularia bona
- q 1, 723 ed mors per violentiam; A mors per iniuriam; E mors iniuriosa (The reading 'mors iniuriosa' is required by context: Et ista est iniuria...)
- q 1, 962 ed citra deum; E citra dubium
- q 1, 963 ed sub eius dominio sunt, modo dico, quod ought to be sub eius dominio sunt. Modo dico quod... cf q 1, 251; q 1, 455
- q 1, 982-983 ed publicanorum... sacrorum; ADE publicorum... sacrorum
- q 1, 1003 ed intentus; D intellectus
- q 1, 1113-1115 ed Samuel; D like Vulgata 1 Sm 21, 3-6: Achimelech
- q 1, 1122 ed iure humano necessaria; ABCD (nē = naturae?) humanae necessaria
- q 1, 1183 ed gloria fuit; D ergo (plus a postulated «non»?)
- q 1, 1256 ed dicit esse filios, idem non esse vectigales; DE dicit esse filios, item non esse vectigales; Migne instead of item: «idest»

- q 1, 1265 ed Vide ecce, si potes; AE vide, caece, si potes (Look, you blind man, can't you)
- q 1, 1274 ed fecit... ne... scandalizentur; DE fecit... ne... scandalizarentur
- q 2, 57 ed ad illum finem maxime dirigit quod; DE ad illum finem maxime dirigit qui
- q 2, 140 ed miles non potest deponere peditem (quasi)... numquam faciat frenum; E... deponere artificem; D... deponere Petrum; AC... deponere petitem
- q 2, 154 ed proportionate; E immediate
- q 2, 361 ed forma in materia; E(AD) forma suprema in materia
- q 2, 438 ed iniungimus consecramus; ought to be inungimus consecramus
- q 2, 463 ed secundum totam [virtutem]; why the parenthesis if in E?
- q 2, 507 ed potestatem specialem; CD better potestatem spiritualementem
- q 2, 555 ed sibi in omnibus oboedire; DE suis monitionibus oboedire
- q 2, 661 ed pontificalis potestas; D pontificalis dignitas
- q 2, 750 ed habetur: Appellat; better in D habetur appellans; E habetur
- q 2, 816 ed ut in nomine Jesu omne genu curvatur (!); DE rightly ut in nomine Jesu omne genu flectatur just as in Vulgate
- q 3, 79 ed aliis opportuniis (!) cottidie occurrentibus; E aliis cottidie occurrentibus
- q 3, 99 ed in gruis; D rightly in gruibus
- q 3, 136 ed per electionem... ad unum principium; DE rightly per relationem... ad unum principium
- q 3, 189 ed quemcumque ligaveris; Vulgata + ACE + context: quaecumque ligaveris (the mysterious 'deinde' in q 3, 184 might be 'dedit')
- q 3, 192 ed: subdicitur; must be subditur
- q 3, 209 ed quemcumque ligaveris; DE quaecumque ligaveritis
- q 3, 219 cf q 3, 189
- q 3, 241 ed (pedes) quod aliquibus iam lavasset; CDE and Augustin: (pedes) quasi aliquibus iam lavasset (the editor's quotation marks are improper)
- q 3, 348 ed wrongly pretium partem; D pretii partem; E (?) partem
- q 3, 369 ed loco sui ipse caput statuit; why not loco sui ipsum...?
- q 3, 374 ed quicquid... solvendum (+ erat?) ipsius auctoritate approbarent; CDE quicquid... ipsius auctoritate comprobarent
- q 4, 15 ed wrongly quod non ab imperatore nec procedere potuit; rightly E quod non ab imperatore processit nec procedere potuit
- q 4, 48 ed rightly debet esse; D not wrongly habet esse
- q 4, 136 ed ad finem illum; E better ad finem ultimum
- q 4, 156 ed strangely a quoque scilicet successore Petri; E better a quovis successore Petri
- q 4, 197-198 ed erunt... habebant; E rightly erunt... habebunt

- q 4, 206 ed wrongly *episcopi... quam apostoli qui eis succedunt*;
D rightly *episcopi... quam apostoli quibus succedunt*
- q 4, 206-209 ed subiunctive mood without reason (*habuerit... acceperit*); (D)E indicative mood correctly (*habuit... acceperunt*)
- q 4, 267 ed contra omnem rationem; D just as well contra ordinem rationis
- q 4, 276 ed auctoritatem; ACDE well within context auctoritatem et potestatem
- q 4, 277 ed auctoritatem habet et potestatem; CDE auctoritatem et potestatem
- q 4, 285 ed Christo convenit vel Christo et eius vicario; dogmatically better CD Christo convenit vel eius vicario
- q 4, 308 ed ends sentence with daring anacolouthon: (Christum) dicere non providum, non prudentem. Correctly ACE (Christum) dicere non providum, non prudentem haereticum est
- q 5, 25 ed puniri potest; dogmatically better D punire potest
- q 6, 87 ed singuli singulos; ACDE singuli singulis.

DAMASUS TRAPP, O.S.A.

Manuel Galindo CARCELLER OAR, *Historia General de la Orden de Agustinos Recoletos*. T. XII: 1867-1891. Presentación por Luis GARAYOA OAR. Madrid, Imprenta Sáez, 1974, 913 pp., ill.

Manuel Carceller, le chroniqueur général de l'Ordre des Augustins Récollets (fondé en Espagne en 1621), publia déjà deux volumes dans l'*Historia General*, notamment les tomes X (1962) et XI (1967), où il raconte l'histoire de l'Ordre resp. pendant les années 1808-35 et 1837-66.

Dans ce livre-ci il décrit les événements qui se sont déroulés de 1867 à 1891 en parlant des sujets suivants: la béatification des missionnaires Francisco de Jesús et Vicente de San Antonio, tous deux martyrisés au Japon en 1632; la province des îles Philippines (9 chap.); la province de Colombie (4 chap.); le commissariat apostolique à Rome, qui gouvernait toujours la Congrégation (les Récollets ne devinrent qu'en 1912 un Ordre autonome).

Plusieurs tables rendent ce travail gigantesque plus accessibles. Quelques photos, représentant spécialement des recteurs provinciaux, des visiteurs et des commissaires apostoliques, illustrent finalement cet étude.

F. HENDRICKX