

MAURIST MANUSCRIPT SOURCES FOR AUGUSTINE'S TWO TREATISES *DE MORIBUS**

Some forty years ago Joseph de Ghellinck advised anyone preparing a critical edition of a patristic text to first review the work of the Benedictines of the Congrégation de Saint-Maur, or Maurists¹). It is good advice and, for works by Augustine, practically indispensable. However, though the Maurists' literary output has often been studied, even eulogized, especially with reference to their Augustine edition²), their editorial *methods* have received far less attention.

This is unfortunate, since for many of Augustine's works the Maurists' edition remains the most recent 'critical' one. Moreover, study of their methods helps disclose the palaeographical principles followed by these seventeenth-century scholars, their sources (some now lost), and the rationale behind their codicological choices. For — as De Ghellinck went on to warn —, «les Mauristes sont de leur siècle»³). Their efforts lack the palaeographical techniques developed in a later age. Their critical apparatus are no great improvement over previous efforts. There is no over-riding concern for word-order in the texts. Only variants deemed interesting are noted by the collators, and not all of those end up in print. Finally, there is still no attempt to establish a genealogy of the manuscripts.

The flaw perhaps most often mentioned by modern commentators on the Maurist edition is, in De Ghellinck's terms, «l'imprécision dans

* The research for this paper was made possible in part by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I also wish to thank Prof. Johannes Divjak of Vienna for furnishing me with a list of pertinent Augustinian manuscripts in France.

¹) J. de GHELLINCK, *Patristique et Moyen Age*. Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale, t. III (Museum Lessianum, section historique, 9), Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1948, 467.

²) R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Literatur und der Kirche im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV», *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (= SPAW), 121 (1890), Abh. 5; 122 (1890), Abh. 8; 127 (1892), Abh. 5; 138 (1898), Abh. 5; A.-M.-P. INGOLD, *Histoire de l'édition bénédictine de saint Augustin*, Paris, Picard, 1903; J. de GHELLINCK, «L'édition de saint Augustin par les Mauristes», *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 57 (Tournai, 1930), 746-774 (with an important bibliography); *idem*, *Patristique...*, III, 412-475; P. McDONALD, «The Maurist Edition of St. Augustine», *The American Benedictine Review* 31 (Atchison, KS, 1980), 153-181 (essentially reproduces Ingold and De Ghellinck).

³) J. de GHELLINCK, *Patristique...*, III, 467.

la désignation des manuscrits utilisés»⁴). And yet, says Michael Gorman, «identifying the manuscripts from which the Maurist editors culled variant readings is the first step toward understanding their editorial techniques and analysing their editions in accordance with contemporary standards of critical scholarship»⁵).

Gorman himself took such a step in the valuable work just cited. By way of a small addition to the efforts already made by him and others⁶), I propose here to explore the *syllabus codicum* furnished by the Maurists with their edition of Augustine's *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* (hereinafter referred to as *mor. I*) and its sister treatise *De moribus Manichaeorum* (hereinafter *mor. II*) — two Augustinian works not critically edited since the Maurists' own edition of 1679⁷) — with the purpose of identifying some of the manuscripts they list there.

CODICOLOGICAL INFORMATION IN THE MAURIST EDITION OF *DE MORIBUS*

The *syllabus codicum* provided by the Maurists with their text of *mor. I* names sixteen manuscripts:

Recognitus est ad mss. Vaticanum [1], Regium [2], Sorbonicos tres [3, 4, 5], Navarricos duos [6, 7], Victorinos totidem [8, 9], e majori conventu Augustinianorum Paris. unum [10], ad Theodoricensem optimae notae [11], ad Gemmeticensem [12], Arnulfensem [13], Cisterciensem [14], Regio-montensem [15], Vedastinum [16]; ad lectiones Belgicorum quinque a Lov. vulgatas; ad editiones Bad. Er. Lov. et ad recentiorem Arnaldi⁸).

⁴) *Ibid.*, 469. This is doubtless why, as P. Petitmengin notes, «sauf pour les Sermons ... on ne possède encore un inventaire systématique de la documentation manuscrite dont disposaient les Mauristes»: «A propos des éditions patristiques de la Contre-Réforme. Le 'Saint Augustin' de la Typographie Vaticane», *Recherches Augustiniennes* 4 (Paris, 1966), 240. See *infra*, n. 6.

⁵) M.M. GORMAN, «The Maurists' Manuscripts of Four Major Works of Saint Augustine, with some remarks on their editorial techniques», *Revue Bénédictine* 91 (Maredsous, 1981), 239.

⁶) M.M. GORMAN, *loc. cit.*, 277-279, provides a bibliography of previous attempts to identify Maurist manuscripts of Augustinian works. See also C. LAMBOT, «Les manuscrits des sermons de saint Augustin utilisés par les Mauristes», *Revue Bénédictine* 79 (Maredsous, 1969), 98-114 (corrected reprint from *Mélanges J. de Ghellinck*, t. I, Gembloux, Duculot, 1951, 251-263).

⁷) *Sancti Aurelii Hipponensis Episcopi opera omnia*, t. I, Paris, Muguet, 1679, cc. 687-716. This is the edition reprinted in Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina* (= PL), 32 (Paris, 1845), cc. 1309-1378. Migne's text, as the more accessible, will usually be referred to here.

⁸) PL 32, cc. 1313-1314 (c. 799 in the 1679 edition).

Though certainly more informative than the codicological data provided in earlier editions, this is hardly the clear and detailed description one would expect in a critical edition today⁹). According to this information, the Maurists consulted the editions of Jodocus Badius Ascensius (= Josse Bade, 1506), Erasmus (1529), and the edition of the theologians of Leuven (1577), as well as Antoine Arnauld's reprint of the Leuven text (1644)¹⁰). They also had access to the (now lost) notes taken on the five mss. used by the *Lovanienses*¹¹); and they consulted sixteen manuscripts on their own.

The *syllabus* for *mor. II* names twelve mss., besides the Leuven notes and earlier editions:

Collatus est cum mss. Sorbonicis tribus [1, 2, 3], Victorinis totidem [4, 5, 6], cum Navarrico [7], Christinaeano [8], Cisterciensi [9], Regio-montensi [10], Gemmeticensi [11], et uno e majori conventu RR. PP. Franciscanorum Paris. [12] cum lectionibus quinque apud Lov. postremo cum editionibus Er. et Lov.¹²).

Of itself, this is sparse information, indeed, but the sparseness can to some extent be fleshed out from other sources. One such source is the often noted Maurist propensity for underlining in *crayon rouge* important features of the text in some of the manuscripts consulted¹³). Another is the list of variant readings included with the edition and which, if limited, is at least more substantial than those in earlier editions. These two indicators will serve as the initial basis for identifying the mss. named in each *syllabus*, with some reference to a third source, the handwritten notes the Maurists took to prepare their edition¹⁴). This third source will be explored more fully in a future

⁹) Some of the vagueness of many *syllabi* in the Maurist edition of Augustine may be due to omissions and ambiguities which crept into the *Indices codicum consulendorum* after their two original compilers were exiled in 1675. See R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», SPAW 121, 43-45 and SPAW 127, 4; A.M.P. INGOLD, *Histoire...*, 33f.; and J. de GHELLINCK, *Patristique...*, III, 443.

¹⁰) On earlier editions, see my «Augustine's two treatises 'De moribus'. Remarks on their textual history», in *Signum Pietatis*. Festschrift für Cornelius Petrus Mayer, 1989.

¹¹) Confirmed by a reference in the handwritten collation for *mor. II* to «mss. quatuor Lovan.» (B.N. lat. 11647, f. 153). On the mss. used by the *Lovanienses*, see «Augustine's two treatises...».

¹²) PL 32, cc. 1345-1346 (c. 800 in the 1679 edition). Omitted are the editions of Josse Bade and Arnauld, which do not contain *mor. II*.

¹³) See R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», SPAW 127, 20f.; J. de GHELLINCK, *Patristique...*, III, 430; and C. LAMBOT, «Les manuscrits...», 100. M.M. GORMAN, «The Maurists'...», notes how this was done for a ms. belonging to the Grands-Augustins (248, n. 3) and for two mss. *Thuanei* (269).

¹⁴) *Operum sancti Augustini recensio benedictina* = B.N. lat. 11645-11666. Supplemental material may be found in fonds français, mss. 17679-17681, 19649-19659, 19665, 19666 and 20941.

article, in which I hope to further advance the work of identifying the manuscripts¹⁵).

OBSERVATIONS ON THE *SYLLABUS CODICUM* OF THE FIRST TREATISE

Some of the manuscripts in each printed list can be identified with certainty, and others at least tentatively. For the first *syllabus codicum*, the identification and supporting arguments are:

[1] The *Vaticanus* is easily identified as the Biblioteca Vaticana's *Vat. lat. 446*, since (a) we still possess the collation done at Rome and sent to the edition's «headquarters» at the Abbaye de Saint-Germain in Paris¹⁶), (b) the same *codex* was used in collating *De vera religione*¹⁷), and (c) absolute confirmation comes from the variant readings which accompany the edition (see Appendix I). This ms. can be dated precisely: 1438¹⁸). By anyone's standards, including the Maurists', this is late. Yet the Maurists were careful, not only to include it, but to give it first place in the *syllabus* of *mor. I*. However, though it also contains *mor. II*, it is missing from the second *syllabus*.

[2] The *Regius* (= from the Bibliothèque du Roi in Paris) is probably the Bibliothèque Nationale's *fonds lat. 1910* (XIII cent.). Originally the property of the Carmelites of the Place Maubert, it entered the Bibliothèque du Roi under the shelfmark «3781»¹⁹). Probable identity is based on the facts that (a) the ms. contains both treatises, and a *Regius* is appealed to in the variant readings for *mor. II* (see Appendix II); and (b) this is the only *Regius* with words and phrases of either text underlined in *crayon rouge*²⁰).

¹⁵) It will also serve as a basis for comparing the list of manuscripts «officially» used with those which seem to have been the real basis of the edition.

¹⁶) Paris, B.N. lat. 11647, f. 141, where the same shelfmark is noted.

¹⁷) K.-D. DAUR, «Prolegomena zu einer Ausgabe von Augustins *De vera religione*», in *Sacris Erudiri* 12 (Brugge, 1961), 346.

¹⁸) Biblioteca Vaticana, *Vat. lat. 446*, colophon on f. 116^v: «per manus Iohannis wernerii de hassya. 1438». K.-D. Daur reads (*op. cit.*, 360): «... de Nassya, 1483».

¹⁹) Twice in their notes the Maurists refer to a ms. as «*Regius. Seu Carmelitarum*»: see R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», *SPAW* 127, 30.

²⁰) Why were other *codices regii*, such as B.N. lat. 2037, not used? C. LAMBOT, «Les manuscrits...», 101, explains: «[La] Bibliothèque du Roi (devenue «Nationale») ... n'était pas, en principe, accessible au public, mais les savants pouvaient y recourir et même emprunter des mss. Les bénédictins ne l'ont pas exploitée à fond, sans doute par suite de

[3, 4, 5] Three *Sorbonici*, that is, *codices* from the Collège de la Sorbonne. For *mor. I* these are most likely the same three mss. definitely identified for *mor. II* as *Paris, Bibl. Nat., fonds lat. 15297, 15302 and 15656*, although for *mor. I* no variants are given which would confirm this.

[6, 7] The two *Navarrici* would be from the Collège de Navarre in Paris. But the only extant *codex* from there I know of is the Bibliothèque Nationale's *fonds lat. 17398* (XIII c.), which does not contain *mor. II*. Nor is there any evidence in the printed *variantes* to confirm this ms. as one the Maurists used.

[8, 9] The two *Victorini* came from the Abbaye de Saint-Victor of the Canons of St. Augustine in Paris. These, now *Bibl. Nat., lat. 14296* (XIV c.) and *Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, 350* (XV c.) can be identified with certainty since (a) in the latter both *mor. I* and *mor. II* have underlinings in *crayon rouge*; (b) the contents of both mss. are described in the Maurist handwritten notes²¹); and (c) l'*Arsenal 350* was used to collate *De magistro*²²), *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*²³), *De div. quaest. LXXXIII*²⁴), *De VIII Dulcitii quaest.*²⁵) and *Quaestiones evangeliorum*²⁶). Each ms. contains the two treatises, and would therefore probably belong among the *tres Victorini* mentioned by the second *syllabus*.

[10] The ms. *e majori conventu Augustinianorum Paris.* (i.e. from the Couvent des Grands-Augustins in Paris) is probably *Bibliothèque Mazarine, 633* (XIII-XIV c.), the only ms. from that monastery I have found which contains *mor. I* (as well as *mor. II*).

catalogues imparfaits ou de difficultés d'ordre administratif». But the fact remains that B.N. lat. 1909 (XIII/XIV c.) is mentioned in the Maurist notes (B.N. lat. 11645, f. 237), yet was not used for *mor. I* (it does not contain *mor. II*).

²¹) B.N. lat. 14296 is listed (under an old shelfmark: CC 7) in B.N. lat. 11654, ff. 339 and 386, and is mentioned (under another shelfmark: B.c. 21) in regard to *Locutionum libri VII* (R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», SPAW 138, 44); L'*Arsenal 350* (under the shelfmark D.d. 11) is referred to in lat. 11645, f. 346^v. In the same source (f. 384^v), a *codex S. Victoris* is referred to as «B.d. 4», a shelfmark mentioned in remarks (subsequently deleted) at the top of B.N. lat. 11647, f. 143, where the collation for *mor. I* begins. But «B.d. 4» is just a later (ca. 1660) catalogue n° of L'*Arsenal 350*; moreover, the Maurists' description of the contents fits this ms.

²²) K.-D. DAUR, preface to his edition, CCL 29, 147.

²³) A. MUTZENBECHER, in CCL 44, lxi.

²⁴) A. MUTZENBECHER, in CCL 44A, lix.

²⁵) *Ibid.*, cxvi.

²⁶) A. MUTZENBECHER, in CCL 44B, xxxix.

The remaining mss. on the list [11-16] came from French libraries outside Paris. With a single exception (the *Cisterciensis* [14]), all can to some degree be identified:

[11] The *Theodoricensis* is from the Abbaye de Saint-Thierry near Reims: this ms. «*optimae notae*» (an accolade which earns this ms. first place on this part of the list, but is insufficient to give it top billing over the Vatican or Parisian sources) is now n° 401 (XII c.) of the Bibliothèque Municipale of Reims²⁷). This ms. contains only the first treatise, which is incomplete. That this is a Maurist source is indicated by (a) underlinings in the text in *crayon rouge*; (b) its appearance elsewhere in the Maurist handwritten notes²⁸); and (c) the fact that this is the only *codex Theodoricensis* known to contain *mor. I*²⁹). Unfortunately, the indications in the printed *variantes* do not of themselves unequivocally confirm *Rouen 401* as our *Theodoricensis* (see Appendix I).

[12] The *Gemmeticensis* is from the Abbaye de St-Pierre in Jumièges. It can be identified with probability as the present-day *Rouen, Bibl. Mun.*, 476 (XII c.), because (a) this ms. (referred to under its old shelfmark: C 21) was described and sent to Saint-Germain for collating in 1671³⁰); (b) the Maurists used this ms. to collate *De libero arbitrio*³¹) and *De vera religione*³²); (c) the text of both treatises *De moribus* in the ms. is marked in *crayon rouge*; and (d) this is the only Jumièges ms. known to contain either treatise *De moribus*³³). However, the one variant reading

²⁷) The ex-libris «*s̄ci theodorici*» appears on the second front flyleaf, and on ff. 1 and 4.

²⁸) B.N. lat. 11645, f. 336 (under the old shelfmark: 47). The contents are described in ff. 325^v and 361.

²⁹) See M.-P. LAFITTE, «Esquisse d'une bibliothèque médiévale. Le fonds de manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Thierry», *Saint-Thierry: Une abbaye du VI^e au XX^e siècle*. Actes du Colloque international d'histoire monastique, Reims-Saint-Thierry, 11 au 14 octobre 1976, Saint-Thierry: Association des Amis de l'Abbaye, 1979, 73-100; B. de MONTFAUCON, *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova*, t. II, Paris, Briasson, 1739, 1230-1237.

³⁰) B.N. lat. 11645, ff. 237 and 367. In the description, the titles of both treatises *De moribus* are checked off in *crayon rouge*.

³¹) W.H. GREEN, preface to his edition, CSEL 74, xii.

³²) K.-D. DAUR, in CCL 32, 173.

³³) See B. de MONTFAUCON, *Bibliotheca...*, II, 1204-1217; also G. NORTIER, «Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bénédictines de Normandie», chap. VI, *Revue Mabillon* 48 (Ligugé, 1958), 99-127. In B.N. lat. 11664, second half, f. 135^v, a *Gemmeticensis* is listed as containing *mor. I* («bis»), *De vera religione*, *De mor. Man.*, *De Genesi c. Manichaeos* and *De libero arbitrio*. If we take the «bis» as indicating our *mor. II*,

ascribed to their *Gemmeticensis* by the Maurists is not found in *Rouen 476* (see Appendix I), leaving the identity less than wholly certain.

[13] The *Arnulfensis* is from the Abbaye de Saint-Arnoul near Metz. It can be certainly identified with *ms. 138* (XI c.) of Metz's Bibliothèque Municipale, for the following reasons: (a) The manuscript's first folio bears the signature «Liber sancti Arnulphi». (b) In the Maurist correspondence³⁴), a *ms.* from the «Biblioteca Sancti Arnulphi Metensis» is said to contain *mor. I*, preceded by *Retractationes* and *De vera religione* and followed by *De opere monachorum* and *De patientia*; such is the arrangement of *Metz 138*. (c) The same *ms.* was used in collating *De vera religione*³⁵). (d) The one reading ascribed to the *Arnulfensis* in the printed *variantes*, while not the precise wording of the *ms.*, is close enough to confirm this as the Maurist source, especially when the other arguments are also taken into consideration³⁶).

[14] «Cisterciensis» probably does not refer to a Cistercian abbey in Paris³⁷); the logical locale would be the Abbaye de Cîteaux, in the diocese of Châlons-sur-Marne, near Dijon³⁸). This abbey was pillaged in 1589 and 1595, and again in 1635. I know of no extant *ms.* originating from there containing either treatise (a *Cisterciensis* is also listed in the second *syllabus*)³⁹), nor is there any mention of the

and read for the notation's «*mor. II*» the *Cont. epist. Fundamenti*, the contents conform to those of *Rouen 476*.

³⁴) B.N. lat. 11645, f. 286.

³⁵) K.-D. DAUR, «Prolegomena...», 346.

³⁶) This *ms.* was probably collated *sur place*, only the collator's notes being sent to St-Germain: see the *syllabus* for *De vera religione* (PL 34, c. 121-122): «lectiones ad nos missas Mss. Cisterciensis, Arnulfensis, Vaticani...».

³⁷) Pace C.T.G. SCHOENEMANN, *Bibliotheca historico-literaria Patrum latinorum a Tertulliano usque ad Gregorium M. et Isidorum Hispalensem ad bibliothecam Fabricii latinam accommodata*, t. II, Lipsiae, in libraria Weidmannia, 1794, 198 (repr. in PL 47, c. 114). No male Cistercian foundation is recorded for Paris at the time, though there was the women's convent of S. Antoine-des-Champs.

³⁸) So R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», SPAW 138, 13.

³⁹) In the handwritten collation *Cist.* is mentioned instead of a number (B.N., lat. 11647, f. 145) meaning that it is not part of their comparison of sixteen *mss.* of *mor. I* but comes from a separate collation. This is the only such occurrence in these notes. A catalogue of *mss.* at Cîteaux made in 1480-82 mentions neither of our two treatises. Cf. *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques de France*, Départements, t. 5 (Paris, Plon, 1889), 339-452.

treatises *De moribus* in the Maurist correspondence relating to Cîteaux⁴⁰), and I am inclined to think that some other Cistercian foundation is meant⁴¹).

[15] *Regio-montensis* indicates a ms. from the Cistercian abbey of Royaumont (diocese of Beauvais). This I believe to be the ms. 09.331 (XIII c.) in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. It was used in collating *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*⁴²), *Contra Academicos*, *De beata vita* and *De ordine*⁴³), as well as *De libero arbitrio*⁴⁴).

[16] The *Vedastinus* is from the Benedictine Abbaye de Saint-Vaast near Arras. I have found two likely mss. from there: one still in Arras (Bibl. Mun., 420), from the XI century and containing an incomplete text of *mor. I*; the other in Boulogne (Bibl. Mun., 49), from the XIII century, with both treatises. I consider *Arras 420* to be the more likely candidate, as it appears to be the only one of the two clearly catalogued in earlier times, and would therefore have been more likely available to Maurist collators⁴⁵).

⁴⁰) Paris, B.N., lat. 11645, ff. 214-226^v. Manuscripts of Augustine are listed in ff. 214-224^v. Aside from this list (on which see M.M. GORMAN, «The Maurists'...», 270-272) «mss. Cistercienses» never seem to be more precisely identified in the Maurist notes, beyond very rough estimates of the dates. See R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», SPAW 138, *passim*.

⁴¹) The problem with that theory is that mss. from other Cistercian abbeys (like the «Regio-montensis») are identified as such.

The Maurists knew of Clairvaux's twelve-volume collection of Augustine's works (now Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 40), of which the first tome (which contains *De moribus*) is noted in a catalogue prepared by them in 1664 (Paris, B.N. lat. 13068, ff. 255-275): see A. VERNET, *La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Clairvaux du XIIe au XVIIIe siècle*, t. I, Paris, Éd. du C.N.R.S., 1979, 650, n. 119. They also knew of ms. 860, which contains *mor. I* (*ibid.*, 652, n. 135), but apparently not about ms. 846, which contains both treatises. However, they tend to refer to mss. from Clairvaux as «Claravallenses».

B. de MONTFAUCON (*Bibliotheca...*, II, 1342 and 1345) notes two mss. from Cistercian abbeys containing «De moribus Ecclesiae»: a *Savinianensis*, n° 26 (= Savigny, Diocese of Avranches in Normandy, suppressed in 1791) and a *Vallis Lucensis* (= Notre-Dame de Vauluisant, Diocese of Sens). Neither appears to be extant.

⁴²) M.M. GORMAN, «The Maurists'...», 263, n. 1.

⁴³) See W.H. GREEN, *Aurelii Augustini Contra Academicos, De beata vita necnon De ordine libri* (Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia, 2), Utrecht-Antwerp, Spectrum, 1956, 8.

⁴⁴) See W.H. GREEN, preface to his edition, in CSEL 74, xiv. He thinks this ms. was used to collate nine works in all.

⁴⁵) The only surviving medieval catalogue of the library's holdings dates from the mid-XII century — too early in any event to have included Boulogne 49, one of 32 mss. transferred from Arras in 1798. Saint-Vaast was secularized in 1790. See Ph. GRIERSON, «La bibliothèque de St-Vaast d'Arras au XIIe siècle», *Revue Bénédictine* 52 (Maredsous, 1940), 117-140.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE *SYLLABUS CODICUM* OF THE SECOND TREATISE

The *syllabus* for *mor. II* names twelve mss., besides the Leuven notes and earlier editions:

[1, 2, 3] Three *Sorbonici* are again mentioned. Today the Bibliothèque Nationale possesses seven mss. from the Sorbonne which contain *mor. I* or both treatises: lat. 15297 (formerly 622), 15298 (611), 15302 (250), 15656 (629), 15665 (697), 15733 (356) and 15737 (360). However, since three *Sorbonici* are also listed in the *syllabus* for *mor. I*, a good working hypothesis is that the same three are indicated in each list. Two of the seven (15665 and 15737) are automatically disqualified because they lack *mor. II*⁴⁶). Of the remaining five (all from the XIII century), lat. 15297 was probably used for *De catechizandis rudibus*⁴⁷), 15298 was used for at least two other Augustinian works⁴⁸), and lat. 15656 was used to collate the *Confessions*⁴⁹). However, the printed variant readings call for the elimination of 15297 and 15733, and confirm 15298, 15302 and 15656 (see Appendix II).

[4, 5, 6] Three *Victorini* are listed, two of which are probably to be identified with those of the first *syllabus* [8, 9]. To date I have found no other ms. of the Abbaye de Saint-Victor containing *mor. II*⁵⁰).

[7] The *Navarricus* mentioned here (certainly not the Bibliothèque Nationale's lat. 17398, which only contains *mor. I*) is presumably the same as the still unidentified *Navarricus* of the first *syllabus*.

⁴⁶) But lat. 15665 was used to collate *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*: K.-D. DAUR, preface to his edition in CCL 49, 26.

⁴⁷) A. WILMART, «Manuscrits du *De catechizandis rudibus*», *Revue Bénédictine* 42 (Maredsous, 1930), 264.

⁴⁸) It is referred to by an old shelfmark (611) in B.N. lat. 11645, f. 392, and was used in collating *Cont. epist. Fundamenti* (lat. 11656, ff. 53-56) as well as *De trinitate* (lat. 11651, f. 1, n. 27). See M.M. GORMAN, «The Maurists'...», 248.

⁴⁹) M.M. GORMAN, *op. cit.*, 241 and 245.

⁵⁰) All Maurist correspondence which speaks of *De moribus* in «codices S. Victoris» refers to only two mss. (see B.N. lat. 11645, ff. 338-343^v, and *supra*, n. 21). Moreover, these are the only two which appear in a sixteenth century catalogue (*Le catalogue de la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris de Claude de Grandrue 1514*, Paris, Éd. du C.N.R.S., 1983, 132f. and 144f.), although the catalogue is not complete (*ibid.*, xviii). Reclassification occurred in the mid-XVIII century (*ibid.*, xix-xxxii), and it is possible Maurist collaborators worked independently and from different catalogues to describe the same *codices*.

[8] The *Christinaeanus* is from the library of the Swedish Queen Christina in Rome. It may certainly be identified with *Reg. lat. 107* in the Vatican library (XI² cent.) because (a) we have the notes containing its collation for *mor. II*⁵¹; and (b) the Maurists used the same ms. to collate *De vera religione*⁵².

[9] *Cisterciensis* may refer to the same unidentified ms. alluded to in the first list [14].

[10] This *Regio-montensis* is certainly *Boston 09.331*, for the reasons given earlier, and because its text conforms exactly to the variant readings the Maurist edition supplies for *mor. II* (see Appendix II).

[11] The *Gemmeticensis* is probably the same Jumièges ms. as [12] of the first list. But no printed *variantes* are supplied.

[12] The only ms. *e majori conventu RR. PP. Franciscanorum Paris.* (i.e. from the Grand Couvent des Cordeliers in Paris) which contains *mor. II* is ms. 631 (XIII cent.) of the Bibliothèque Mazarine. A «codex Franciscanorum magni conventus Parisiensis» was also used in collating *De doctrina christiana* and *De fide ad Petrum*⁵³, which *Mazarine 631* also contains.

CONCLUSIONS

1. What point has been reached in this search for the identity of the mss. the Maurists listed in the two *syllabi codicum*? If we arrange their two lists side by side, the following picture emerges (certain identity is indicated in *italic*, probable is indicated by (?), mss. not yet identified are between []):

⁵¹) Paris, B.N. lat. 11647, f. 151

⁵²) R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», SPAW 138, 141. Extant catalogues of the library of the Abbaye de la Trinité at Fécamp in Normandy, where it originates, list only *Reg. lat. 107* as a *Fiscannensis* containing *mor. I* or *mor. II*. On this abbey and its mss., see G. NORTIER, «La bibliothèque de Fécamp au Moyen-Age», *L'abbaye bénédictine de Fécamp*. Ouvrage scientifique du XIII^e centenaire 658-1958, vol. II, Fécamp, L. Durand et Fils, 1960, 221-237; and B. BRANCH, «Inventories of the Library of Fécamp from the Eleventh and Twelfth Century», *Manuscripta* 23 (Saint Louis, 1979), 159-172.

⁵³) B.N. lat. 11650, ff. 74-76, and lat. 11645, f. 339. See R.C. KUKULA, «Die Mauriner...», SPAW 138, 42 and 65f.

*mor. I**mor. II**Vaticanus* = VATICAN, Vat.

lat. 446, XV c.

Regius = Paris, B.N.

lat. 1910, XIII c. (?)

3 *Sorbonici*:

Paris, B.N. lat. 15297 (?)

Paris, B.N. lat. 15302 (?)

Paris, B.N. lat. 15656 (?)

2 *Navarrici*:

Paris, B.N. lat. 17398 (?)

[*Navarricus*]2 *Victorini*:

PARIS, B.N. lat. 14296, XIV c.

PARIS, l'Arsenal, 350, XV c.

Augustinianorum = Paris,

Mazarine, 633, XIII-XIV c. (?)

Theodoricensis = REIMS,

Bibl. Mun., 401, XII c.

Gemmeticensis = Rouen,

Bibl. Mun., 476, XII c. (?)

Arnulfensis = METZ,

Bibl. Mun., 138, XI c.

[*Cisterciensis*]*Regio-montensis* = Boston, Museum
of Fine Arts, 09.331, XIII c. (?)*Vedastinus* = Arras, Bibl. Mun.,

420, XI c. (?)

3 *Sorbonici*:

PARIS, B.N. lat. 15297, XIII c.

PARIS, B.N. lat. 15302, XIII c.

PARIS, B.N. lat. 15656, XIII c.

3 *Victorini*:

Paris, B.N. lat. 14296, XIV c. (?)

Bibl. de l'Arsenal, 350, XV c. (?)

[*Victorinus* (?)][*Navarricus*]*Christinaeanus* = VATICAN, Reg.

lat. 107, XI c.

[*Cisterciensis*]*Regio-montensis* = BOSTON, Muse-
um of Fine Arts, 09.331, XIII c.*Gemmeticensis* = Rouen,

Bibl. Mun., 476, XII c. (?)

Franciscanorum = Paris, Bibl.

Mazarine, 631, XIII c. (?)

(Regius = PARIS, B.N. lat. 1910,
XIII c.)

In the first list the *Vaticanus*, *Victorini*, *Theodoricensis* and *Arnulfensis* are identified with certainty. The identity of the *Regius*, *Sorbonici*, one *Navarricus*, the *Augustinianorum*, *Gemmeticensis*, *Regio-montensis* and *Vedastinus* may be deemed probable. That leaves only one *Navarricus* and the *Cisterciensis* for which a corresponding manuscript has yet to be found.

The same two mss. are the only ones (if we leave aside the mysterious third *Victorinus*) without at least probable identification in the second *syllabus*. Clearly identified are the *Sorbonici*, *Christinaeanus* and *Regio-montensis*, as well as the *Regius* mentioned in the printed

variantes (see Appendix II) but not in the *syllabus*. Probably identified are two (of three?) *Victorini*, the *Gemmeticensis* and the *Franciscanorum*.

2. Further progress in identification of the Maurists' manuscripts would require demonstrating that the *Sorbonici*, *Victorini*, *Navarricus*, *Regius*, *Regio-montensis* and *Gemmeticensis* are the same in both *syllabi*. But that in turn must await closer scrutiny of the *variantes* reported in the Maurists' handwritten notes.

3. Regardless of whether other mss. used by them can be positively identified, the most cursory glance over the two *syllabi* makes it clear that the Maurists are ambivalent on whether *mor. I* and *mor. II* constitute «duo libri unius ejusdemque operis» (however they may choose to title these treatises in the edition)⁵⁴: they provide a separate *syllabus* for each «liber» (something they would not do if the second were considered merely a continuation of the first), and the lists are disparate. Besides the difference in number (sixteen for the first, twelve for the second), each list includes *codices* not mentioned in the other (seven in the first, three in the second), even then a *codex* includes the other treatise⁵⁵. For the Maurists, *mor. I* and *mor. II* appear to be distinct treatises⁵⁶, with separate bases of collation and separate manuscript traditions.

4. The addition of the Franciscan ms. to the second *syllabus* [12] is intriguing because it alters the earlier Paris-Rome-France arrangement (itself a change from the Rome-Paris-France order of the first list) to one now of Paris-Rome-France-Paris. Its last position in the *syllabus* suggests a motive other than palaeographical for its inclusion. We note as well the careful arrangement in the first *syllabus* of a *Vaticanus*, followed immediately by a *Regius*, and then the *Sorbonici*. Gorman suggests a plausible reason for this:

[Political] considerations probably account for many of the manuscripts the Maurists selected for their editions of St. Augustine's works and may have determined the choice of some of the variant readings they presented in the notes for their editions.

⁵⁴) PL 32, c. 1309-1310: «S. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi de moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum libri duo. Liber primus de moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae»; c. 1345-1346: «Liber secundus de moribus Manichaeorum».

⁵⁵) As do the *Vaticanus* and *Christinaeanus*.

⁵⁶) A further indication is that in preparing an *Index operum* (B.N. lat. 11664), the Maurists remain unclear as to the relationship between the two treatises. They list them one after the other, but as still distinct: «Liber de moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae/Liber de moribus Manichaeorum».

If the Maurists could appear to be the continuators of the revision of the Louvain edition of 1577 which was undertaken by six theologians from the Sorbonne in 1668 but abandoned after six months, it was surely not harmful for them to appear to be at the same time the heirs of the edition of St. Augustine's works proposed by Sixtus V (1585-1590) on which the *correctores Vaticani* worked from 1593 to 1598 and again from 1602 to 1607 before the project was abandoned by Paul V in 1608. The Maurists could demonstrate their links to these projects by mentioning *codices Vaticani* and *codices Sorbonici* in their *syllabi codicum* and by occasionally citing a few variant readings from these manuscripts in their notes to these editions⁵⁷).

Thus in the first *syllabus* the *Vaticanus*, though manifestly late, comes first; then come Parisian mss., of which the first is the *Regius*, followed by the *Sorbonici*. The «Theodoricensis optimaе notae» is referred to only twice — one less than the *Vaticanus* — in the list of variants of *mor. I*. For this *syllabus*, not just the selection, but the arrangement of the *codices* selected in the printed list reflects a political motivation.

5. In the quality of their work, the Maurists remain closer to the previous editions than to the results of modern palaeography. But by incorporating some of the work previously done on Augustine's writing in their own edition, and by making theirs the best edition of Augustine's works down to their time, and in some cases even to ours, their efforts must be deemed the obvious starting-point for any new edition of Augustine's texts, among them the two treatises «De moribus».

Appendix I

VARIANT READINGS ACCOMPANYING THE EDITION OF *MOR. I*

Additional evidence for the identity of some *codices* named by the Maurists comes from the *lectiones variantes* which accompany their edition. Here I am following the format set down by M.M. Gorman⁵⁸), which is to say that the left column gives the reading as the Maurists report it (according to the text, by column and line, chapter and paragraph, in the more accessible Migne edition); and the right column

⁵⁷) M.M. GORMAN, «The Maurists'...», 272f.

⁵⁸) «The Maurists'...», 241-243, 247, 251, 254-258 and 274-277.

locates the variant reading in a *codex* I believe to be one of those referred to in the *syllabi*⁵⁹). «CR» after a variant reading means that it has been underlined in *crayon rouge* in the manuscript.

PL 32

Codex Maurinorum

mor. I

1318, 48 (10:17) deprædati]

Vaticanus codex [1] habet, *depravati* [1] VATICAN, Vat. lat. 446, f. 48^v] *deprauati*

1322, 9 (15:25) vis]

Theodoricensis codex [11]: *Ita sit affectus in mentibus vestris.* [11] REIMS 401, f. 15^v] *ita sit affectus in m̃tib; ũris* (CR)

Arnulfensis [13]: *Ita sit notitia in mentibus vestris.* [13] METZ 138, f. 83^r] *utinā notitia ita in m̃tib; ũris*

Cisterciensis [14] denum habet: *Ita essent effectus in mentibus vestris.* [14] Apparently lost.

1324, 20 (17:30) Oportet multas haereses esse]

Codex Vaticanus [1] et [1] VATICAN, Vat. lat. 446, f. 50^r] *Oportet hereses eē*

Cisterciensis [14] omittunt, *multas.* [14] Apparently lost.

1335, 41 (29:61) fidem]

Theodoricensis codex [11]: *Et auctoritatis ratione cogis exigere in fidem.* [11] REIMS 401, f. 27^r] & *auctoritatis ratione cogis exigere in finē* (CR)

1338, 40 (31:67) rationem]

Plerique codices habent, *traditionem*: pro quo Latinus Latinus et Antonius Arn. legendum putarunt, *rationem*. Sic porro legitur in Ms. Vaticano [1]. [1] VATICAN; Vat. lat. 446, f. 54^r] *Rationē tñ etiam ip̃i reddunt uni*

1341, 9 (33:72) superbum et commentitium nomen Apostoli]

Edit, *Apostolatus*. Mss. nonnulli,

⁵⁹) Not listed are variant readings only identified as in «mss. plures», etc., without a more specific description.

Apostolus. Gemmeticensis codex [12] ROUEN 476, f. 18^v] *Apostolus*
[12], *Apostoli*. (CR)

This comparison leaves no doubt as to the identity of the *Vaticanus*. Of themselves, the variant readings for the *Theodoricensis* would leave some questions, as one reading conforms and one does not. But other factors pointed out earlier make its identity as *Reims 401* virtually certain. On the other hand, the *Arnulfensis* and *Gemmeticensis* are more problematic, since the one reading given for each is not exactly as reported. In the case of *Metz 138* it is the variant «noticia» which is important, rather than the exact conformity of the entire phrase. As to *Rouen 476*, a collator's mistake, at Metz or at Saint-Germain, could explain the lapse; but that seems too facile, and for now the identity of the *Gemmeticensis* must be termed uncertain. But at least the Rouen ms. is a strong possibility, whereas for the *Cisterciensis* no likely candidate has yet appeared.

Note that no *Sorbonici* are mentioned here, nor is the *Regiomontensis*, though they are named in the second set of *variantes*. There is no mention whatever of the *Regius*, *Augustinianorum* or *Vedastinus*, and no *Navarrici* or *Victorini* are mentioned in either set of variant readings.

Appendix II

VARIANT READINGS ACCOMPANYING THE EDITION OF *MOR. II*

The variant readings supplied by the Maurists also help confirm the identity of four mss. in the second *syllabus*:

PL 32

Codex Maurinorum

mor. II

1352, 3 (9:15) *cogens*]

Editi et plerique Mss. non habent, *vel* [10] BOSTON 09.331, f. 142^v] &
servire quempiam cogens; quae *servire quēpiam cogens*
verba ex codice Regio-montensi [1] PARIS lat. 15297, p. 199]

[10] et tribus Sorbonicis [1, 2, 3] adjecimus⁶⁰).

ul' seruire quēpiam cogens
[2] PARIS lat. 15302, f. 222^v]
uel seruire q̄piam cogens
[3] PARIS lat. 15656, f. 101^r]
uel seruire quempiam cogens

1354, 41 (11:21) An articulata
Dei forma est]

Ms. Regius [?] sic habet: *an particula
Dei anima est sicut.*

PARIS lat. 1910, f. 203^v] an pticula
dei anima est sicut (CR)

1365, 33 (16:46) an partem Dei
discedere existimandum est]

Sic. Er., cui suffragantur Mss. Sorbo-
nici tres [1, 2, 3]⁶¹) et Regio-
montensis [10].

[1] PARIS lat. 15297, p. 206]
diuinam ptem discedere (*corr. from*
excedere) existimandū est ~
[2] PARIS lat. 15302, f. 226^v]
diuinam partem discedere existiman-
dum est ~
[3] PARIS lat. 15656, f. 106^r]
diuinam partem discedere existiman-
dum ē ~
[10] BOSTON 09.331; f. 149^r]
diuinā ptem discedere existimandū
ē ~

Clearly, *Boston 09.331* can be identified as the *Regio-montensis* of the second *syllabus* (and perhaps the first as well). Equally clearly, Paris lat. 15298 and 15733 must be disqualified as *Sorbonici* the Maurists used here, leaving three possible candidates. Note the *Regius*, which makes an appearance here without any mention of it in the second *syllabus*. Not mentioned in the *variantes* are the *Christinaeanus*, *Cisterciensis*, *Gemmeticensis* and *Franciscanorum*; nor, as noted earlier, are the *Navarricus* and *Victorini*. In fact, no *codex* cited in the *variantes* for the first treatise appears in the second, and vice versa.

Ottawa

J. Kevin COYLE

⁶⁰) The phrase in question is missing from Paris, B.N. lat. 15298 (f. 298^v) and 15733 (f. 218^r).

⁶¹) Paris, B.N. lat. 15298 (f. 303^r): «deum aute(!) pestē discede(!) existimandum ē»; lat. 15733 (f. 222^r): «deum an pestem disced'e existimandū ÷ ~».