

A MORE ORIGINAL VERSION OF S. 142 OF SAINT AUGUSTINE*

S. 142 and its editorial history

S. 142 is a homily on John 14:6 (Ego sum uia, ueritas et uita) with special attention to the virtue of humility and the gift of charity. Its complexity suggests that it was preached before a rather sophisticated congregation. According to François Dolbeau, the sermon belongs to the years 404-406 and was possibly preached somewhere in *Africa Proconsularis*, early in 404.¹ These suggestions were taken over in the dating lists of É. Rebillard (404) and R. Gryson (404-406). E. Hill has presented 413-417 as an alternative date, albeit in a rather hesitant way.²

The Maurist edition of s. 142 (PL 38, cc. 778-784) was based on two collections of sermons³ that had both known a large diffusion in medieval Europe: the early medieval collection *De uerbis Domini* (vd), which constitutes the first part of a larger whole of homilies on the Gospels and the letters of the New Testament (*De uerbis Domini et Apostoli* = vda),⁴ and the Arlesian *Quinquaginta homiliae* (q).⁵ The former collection only offered the sermon's first five paragraphs dedicated to John 14:6 (vd title: *Item eiusdem de uerbis Domini in euangelio secundum Iohannem: Ego sum uia, ueritas et uita*),⁶ whereas the latter contained the entire text edited by the Maurists (q title: *De eo quod scriptum est: Ego sum uia, ueritas et uita* [= §§1-5], *et de sequendo Christum, et de uera caritate* [= remaining paragraphs]).

In *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* (1928), André Wilmart published an enlarged version of s. 142 (s. Wilmart 11), which had

* I thank prof. Luc De Coninck, prof. Rita Beyers, dr. Anthony Dupont and dr. Tom Deneire for their comments on a first draft of this article.

¹ See F. DOLBEAU (1996a), 290. There is no suggestion of a date in P.-P. VERBRACKEN (1976), 88 + 195.

² See É. REBILLARD (1999), 779; R. GRYSOEN (2007), 239; E. HILL (1992), 413 + 423 n. 8.

³ See C. LAMBOT (1969a), 108.

⁴ For vda, see L. DE CONINCK (2006) (vd) and G. PARTOENS (2008), LXV-CLII (*De uerbis Apostoli*). Both publications offer further bibliography.

⁵ For q, see L. DE CONINCK (2008), XXIX-XXXI (with further bibliography).

⁶ In manuscript *Madrid Biblioteca Nacional* 78 (A.8) (XII), the vd version of s. 142 is fused with *Io. eu. tr.* 71, 1-3 (ff. 181^v-182^v). The title of this new item is: *In natali sanctorum apostolorum Philippi et Iacobi*.

been preserved under the sermon's *vd* title on ff. 148^v-152 of the exceptional *vd* codex *Vaticanus latinus* 471 (XII), origin: *Bellevaux* (= V).⁷ *S. Wilmart* 11 was re-edited in 1930 by G. Morin on the basis of *vd*, *q* and *V* (*Miscellanea Agostiniana* [= *MA*] 1, pp. 695-705). Morin divided the sermon into 14 paragraphs; the present article will continue to do so. Within Morin's numbering the additional fragment discovered by Wilmart occupies paragraphs 6b-10a (p. 699, l. 20-p. 702, l. 7 *utquid habebo omnia-sum contra tumorem*).

Together with *London Brit. Libr. Add. 10942* (XII med. or 3/4), origin: *La Charité* (foundation of *Bellevaux* in the diocese of *Besançon*) (*De uerbis Apostoli*), manuscript *V* (*vd*) represents the second redaction of an enlarged and adapted version of *vda* (*vda**). The first redaction of this version was produced at Lyon by the Carolingian deacon Florus and is represented by *Paris Bibl. Nat. lat. 2017* (XI ex.), origin and provenance: *Moissac* (*vd*), and *Dijon Bibl. Mun. 143* (XII in.), origin and provenance: *Cîteaux* (*vda*).⁸ Since the latter manuscripts still contain the typical *vd* version of the sermon,⁹ we may assume that the presence of *s. Wilmart* 11 in manuscript *V* is due to the second redactor of *vda**.¹⁰ In a recent article, I have tried to show that this second redactor probably worked in the scriptorium of Cluny.¹¹ Others believe, however, that *both* redactions of *vda** are due to Florus of Lyon.¹²

According to Wilmart, manuscript *V* follows the *vd* text for the first five paragraphs (*MA* 1, p. 695, l. 1-p. 699, l. 6), while its text of §6a (p. 699, ll. 7-20 *non haec nos-in me habebis*) and 10b-14 (p. 702, l. 8-705, l. 24) is that of *q*.¹³ Wilmart thus seemed to presuppose that *V* contains a reconstruction of *s. 142* that is based on *vd* for §§1-5 and

⁷ Voir M. VATTASSO-P. FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI (1902), 350-351 (description); A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK (2000), 102 + n. 406 (origin); G. PARTOENS (2007), *passim*.

⁸ Bibliography on the London, Paris and Dijon manuscripts is given in G. PARTOENS (2007), 189-190. For Florus as the compiler of the first version of *vda** (a hypothesis that was first suggested by F. DOLBEAU [1996b], 26 [n° 25] and A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK [1999], 183 n. 55), see G. PARTOENS (2007), 217-222.

⁹ In both manuscripts, *s. 142* has the typical *vd* ending ([...] *et cum ipso omnia possidebis*; §5). See *Paris Bibl. Nat. lat. 2017*, ff. 118-119; *Dijon Bibl. Mun. 143*, ff. 125^v-126^v.

¹⁰ This is a correction of what I have suggested in G. PARTOENS (2007), 200 and 222 (above).

¹¹ See G. PARTOENS (2007), 222-226.

¹² This hypothesis was proposed by A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK (1999), 183-184. For an anonymous defence of this view, see the review of G. PARTOENS (2007) in *Medioevo Latino* 29 (2008), 630 (n° 6760).

¹³ See A. WILMART (1928), 284.

on *q* for §§6a + 10b-14. The same can be deduced from the critical apparatus of Morin's re-edition of the sermon: while the text of the *q* representatives strongly differs from that of *vd* and *V* for the first five paragraphs – e.g. *vd* and *V* contain many sentences and word sequences that are absent from *q* and *vice versa* – it does not differ in a substantial way from *V* for paragraphs 6a and 10b-14. Moreover, I will show below that for the Wilmart fragment (§§6b-10a) *V* depends on a third branch within the transmission of s. 142.

For several reasons, Wilmart considered the fragment he discovered authentic.¹⁴ (1) The words *Veni ad me, si uis omnia possidere* at the beginning of his fragment (§6b; p. 699, l. 23) refer to the words *et ipsum tene in quo possis omnia possidere* above in §6a (l. 11). (2) Some phrases at the end of the added fragment (*regnum, quo non intratur nisi per iter angustum* [§10a; p. 702, ll. 4-5] and *dat calicem [...] contra tumorem* [l. 7]) are taken up again in the first lines of §10b (*per angustum me uocas: non possum intrare per angustum* [ll. 8-9] and *Sarcina uobis tumor uester est* [l. 10]). (3) Wilmart's fragment explicitly refers to paragraphs 1-6a: *Sed quia, ut diximus, fratres, tumore superbiae non redibamus* (§10a; p. 701, l. 31) ~ *Tumuerat autem superbia, et ipso tumore per angustum redire non poterat* (§5; p. 698, ll. 6-7); *dat calicem amarum, de quo paulo ante locutus sum, contra tumorem* (§10a; p. 702, l. 7) ~ *Bibat contra tumorem poculum amarum, sed salubre: bibit poculum humilitatis* (§5; p. 698, ll. 12-13). (4) The fragment contains several other (strong and less strong) references to §§1-6a: *Non ueniret ad te humilis, si tibi nollet innotescere* (§6b; p. 699, l. 27-p. 700, l. 1) + *humilis factus est, ut exaltaretur excelsus* (§10a; p. 701, ll. 32-33) ~ *Via Christus, humilis Christus, ueritas et uita Christus, excelsus et Deus* (§2; p. 695, ll. 18-19); *Quod semetipsum exinaniuit formam serui accipiens, donauit hoc tibi auerso a se, conuerso autem ad se seruauit tibi Ego et Pater unum sumus* (§6b; p. 700, ll. 12-14) ~ *qui conuersum liberat, punit auersum* (§4; p. 698, ll. 3-4); *do quod te erigat* (§9; p. 701, ll. 20-21) + *Ergo erigamur* (l. 26) ~ *Erigunt nos diuinae lectiones* (§1; p. 695, l. 3); *Praestitit indignis mortem suam, seruat dignis uitam suam* (§9; p. 701, ll. 29-30) ~ *Ecce quid tibi praestitum est impio: iam pio quid seruatur?* (§5; p. 699, ll. 2-3), etc.

The reason for the elimination of §§6b-10a from the *q* text was simple according to Wilmart: 'Estimant que le discours était assez long déjà, le compilateur des *Quinquaginta* [= Caesarius?] aura

¹⁴ See A. WILMART (1928), 288-289.

retranché sommairement ce morceau; il est représenté, de fait, par deux courtes phrases, qui ne suffisent pas à cacher la déchirure.¹⁵ The sentences in question are: *Nemo cognoscit Patrem nisi Filius. Noli desperare: ueni ad Filium. Audi quod sequitur: Et cui uoluerit Filius reuelare* (PL 38, c. 782, ll. 4-6). These sentences were taken from the fragment that was left out (MA 1, p. 699, ll. 25-26), which suggests indeed that the situation in *q* is due to an intentional manipulation and not to the loss of some folia in the source used by the compiler of *q*.

In *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* (1991), François Dolbeau has demonstrated that s. 142 has to be identified with item X⁶, 72 in Possidius' *Indiculum* (*Ex euangelio: Ego sum uia et ueritas et uita*) and that it was followed by a *post sermonem* on the burial of catechumens in a now lost manuscript from Lorsch (items 9a and b in the manuscript's description that is preserved on f. 17^v of *Vat. Pal. lat. 1877* (IX), origin: *Lorsch: Ex eo quod dictum est: Ego sum uia, ueritas et uita, et cetera* [9a]. *Hic subiungitur de sepultura caticu-minorum* [9b]). The carthusian codex *Mainz I 9* (XIV-XV), which has partly transmitted the collection that was present in the lost manuscript of Lorsch (ff. 1-73 and 162-252), has not preserved the main part of s. 142, but still contains its *post sermonem* (Dolbeau 7).¹⁶

The actual s. 142 is thus a combination of s. Wilmart 11 and s. Dolbeau 7. In the present article, I will present an alternative and – in my view – more original version of s. Wilmart 11.

A new edition of s. 142, 6-10

Neither Wilmart in his 1928 article, nor Morin in his 1930 edition of s. Wilmart 11 have signalled that paragraphs 6b-10a are also present in two collections of Augustinian sermons that are much older than manuscript V and that – just like *q* – belong to the Arlesian collections, viz. the 'Collection de Lyon' and the 'Collection de Mar-moutier'. Both collections are known through only one direct witness. The 'Collection de Lyon' has been preserved through a 7th-century codex that once belonged to the Cathedral Library of Lyon, where it was annotated by Florus¹⁷ and used by the latter as a source for sev-

¹⁵ See A. WILMART (1928), 284.

¹⁶ For s. Dolbeau 7 and the identification of s. 142 with *Ind.* X⁶, 72, see F. DOLBEAU (1996a), 297-303; (1996b), 20 (n° 15).

¹⁷ See C. CHARLIER (1945), 78 + 83; (1947), 148. Further bibliography in G. PARTOENS (2007), 221 n. 93.

eral homiletical fragments in his *Expositio beati Pauli collecta ex libris sancti Augustini*¹⁸ and for several items in the first redaction of *vda**.¹⁹ The original codex can be recomposed on the basis of *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 788, ff. 49-58^v + *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604, ff. 1-33^v + *Paris Bibl. Nat. n.a.l.* 1594, ff. 1-42^v + *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604, ff. 34-94^v. The 'Collection de Marmoutier', on the other hand, has been handed down through the folia 91-159^v of manuscript *Tours Bibl. Mun.* 279 (IX ex.) (= *M*).²⁰ S. 142 is found on ff. 67-74 of *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604 (= *L*) and on ff. 135-138^v of *M*.

Apart from some omissions in §§13-14, which are due to an editorial intervention (Caesarius of Arles?),²¹ the Lyonese manuscript also presents three large omissions that are due to the loss of folia in this very manuscript. The first occurs between ff. 67^v and 68, and covers *MA* 1, p. 695, l. 18-p. 696, l. 21 *uia christus humilis-ostendit peccatum quod* (= loss of one folium). The others immediately precede and follow the folia containing the Wilmart fragment (ff. 70^r-72^v) and are due to the loss of respectively one and two folia: p. 698, l. 18-p. 699, l. 20 *portam dicentem ego-in me habebis* and p. 702, l. 8-p. 703, l. 26 *dicebas non possum-caritas non aemulatur*. It is most striking that the first words on the first line of f. 70^r coincide with the incipit of the Wilmart fragment (*utquid habebis omnia* [...]; p. 699, l. 20), while the last words on the last line of f. 72^v are identical with the explicit of the very same fragment ([...] *sum contra tumorem*; p. 702, l. 7).

Earlier research has demonstrated that the Lyonese representative of the 'Collection the Lyon' had lost several folia by the middle of the 9th century.²² So it is quite possible that the three *lacunae* indicated above could already have been observed in the Carolingian period.²³ Be that as it may, the manuscript had lost the four folia of

¹⁸ See C. LAMBOT (1961), 100; 287; 432; F. DOLBEAU (1996a), 537.

¹⁹ See G. PARTOENS (2007), 221-222.

²⁰ The most recent treatment of both Arlesian collections is L. DE CONINCK (2008), XXXII-XXXIV (with further bibliography).

²¹ For these *lacunae*, see n. 35. For Caesarian traces in the 'Collection de Lyon', see L. DE CONINCK (2008), XXXII-XXXIII.

²² See L. DE CONINCK (2008), XXXII (with further bibliography) as well as the *notice détaillée* concerning *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604 on <http://florus.bm-lyon.fr/>.

²³ To be clear: several passages in the extant text of s. 142 in *L* are demarcated by signs typical of Florus of Lyon (⌞ ... ⌞, K... F). None of these passages, however, is quoted in Florus' *Expositio beati Pauli collecta ex libris sancti Augustini*. Florus' only quotation of s. 142 figures in the section on Rom. 5 (verse 6) and is quoted at full length in the Maurist description of the *Expositio* (PL 119, cc. 289-290). This quotation (*MA* 1, p. 698, l. 25-p. 699, l. 6 *omnia mihi tradita-ipso omnia possidebis*) belongs to the part of the sermon's text that is covered by the *lacuna* that

s. 142 when it gave rise to a specific branch within the sermon's transmission. Several later homiliaries of German and Austrian origin offer s. 142 (with inclusion of the Wilmart fragment) under the same title as *L* (*de eo quod in Christo, qui uia est, omnia possideat christianus, si mitis sit et humilis corde*) and with the three *lacunae* that were caused in *L* by the loss of four folia, as well as with the editorial omissions that characterize §§13-14 in the Lyonese manuscript:²⁴ *Wolfenbüttel Herzog-August-Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 237 (Helmst. 204) (1178-1191)*, origin and provenance: *monastery of Lamspringe* (ff. 109^v-112),²⁵ *Melk Stiftsbibliothek 432 (218) (XV) (ff. 150-153)*²⁶ and *Wien Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 1495 (XV) (ff. 92^v-94^v)*²⁷ / *lat. 4730 (XV) (ff. 189/190-193/194)*.²⁸ Moreover, s. 142 is not the only item for which these manuscripts ultimately depend on *L*. The following overview, which compares the content of *L* with that of the medieval collection *De lapsu mundi* as well as with *Wolfenbüttel Herzog-August-Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 237 (Helmst. 204) (Wo)* and *Wien Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 4730 (XV) (Wi)*²⁹ suggests that the *L* version of s. 142 ended up in the German and Austrian homiliaries through the mediation of a collection that contained a group of *L* sermons that was very similar to, but not identical with the group of *L* sermons in *De lapsu mundi* as the latter is described by Pierre-Patrick Verbraken in his *Études critiques (la)*:³⁰

immediately precedes the Wilmart fragment (p. 698, l. 18-p. 699, l. 20 *portam dicentem ego in me habebis*). This observation, however, does not necessarily imply that the *lacuna* in question is posterior to Florus' use of the manuscript, for the fragment quoted in the *Expositio* may have been borrowed from a *vd* source. It bears the title *ex sermone de uerbis euangelii*, coincides with the end of s. 142 in the *vd* collection and clearly offers the *vd* text as it is represented in Morin's critical apparatus.

²⁴ For these editorial omissions, see n. 35.

²⁵ See O. VON HEINEMANN (1963), 185 (n° 237: written at Lamspringe); R. KURZ (1979), 508-509 (n° 204 Helmst.).

²⁶ See *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum qui in bibliotheca monasterii Mellicensis O.S.B. seruantur*. Vol. I (Vindobonae 1889), 300-315; D. WEBER (1993), 199-201.

²⁷ See D. WEBER (1993), 353-355 (*lat. 1495*).

²⁸ See D. WEBER (1993), 409-410 (*lat. 4730*).

²⁹ A global comparison of *Melk Stiftsbibliothek 432 (218)*, *Wien Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 1495*, and *Wi* shows that their *L* items stem from a common source. Since *Wi* has retained the largest number of *L* items, I have chosen it as representative of the three Austrian homiliaries in the above overview.

³⁰ For *De lapsu mundi* and its dependence on *L*, see P.-P. VERBRACKEN (1976), 230-231; L. DE CONINCK (2008), XLI-XLII.

all authentic sermons in <i>L</i>		<i>la</i>	<i>Wo</i>	<i>Wi</i>
Lyon BM 788	* ff. 49-54 ^v / lost part / 55-55 ^v s. 36, 2-9 + 11 The sermon was still complete when it was lent to (an ancestor of) <i>la</i> . See C. LAMBOT (1961), 432.	art. 2 s. 36 (complete)	ff. 96-98 s. 36 (complete)	—
	* ff. 55 ^v -58 ^v s. 82	—	—	—
Lyon BM 604	* ff. 1-3 s. 202	—	—	ff. 126-127 ^v <i>Wi</i> depends for this sermon on Alanus of Farfa, 1. 39. See D. WEBER (1993), 409.
	* ff. 3-7 s. 309	—	—	—
	* ff. 7-10 s. 348	art. 4	ff. 102-103	—
	* ff. 10-15 ^v / lost part / ff. 16-21 s. 60, 1-7 (ending in <i>qui tale consilium dedit</i>) + s. 389, 4-6	art. 1 s. 60, 1-7 (ending in <i>qui tale consilium dedit</i>) + s. 389, 4-6	ff. 92 ^v -96 s. 60, 1-7 (ending in <i>qui tale consilium dedit</i>) + s. 389, 4-6	ff. 212 ^v /213 ^v -218 ^v /219 ^v s. 60, 1-7 (ending in <i>qui tale consilium dedit</i>) + s. 389, 4-6
	* ff. 21-23 ^v / lost part / ff. 24-25 s. 347, 1-3 (ending in <i>paenitentiae dolore fleuerunt</i>) + s. 191, 2-4 (ending in <i>spiritali seruat amplexu</i>)	art. 25 s. 347, 1-3 (ending in <i>paenitentiae dolore fleuerunt</i>)	ff. 100 ^v -102 s. 347, 1-3 (ending in <i>paenitentiae dolore fleuerunt</i>) + s. 191, 2-4 (ending in <i>spiritali seruat amplexu</i>)	ff. 57-59 ^v s. 347, 1-3 (ending in <i>paenitentiae dolore fleuerunt</i>) + s. 191, 2-4 (ending in <i>spiritali servat amplexu</i>)

all authentic sermons in <i>L</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>Wo</i>	<i>Wi</i>
<i>Paris</i> <i>Bibl. Nat.</i> <i>n.a.l.</i> 1594			
* ff. 1-4 ^v <i>s.</i> 212	—	—	—
* ff. 8 ^v -19 ^v <i>s.</i> 22	art. 6	ff. 89 ^v -92 ^v	—
* ff. 20-28 <i>s.</i> 38	art. 3	ff. 98-100 ^v	—
* ff. 28-31 ^v <i>s.</i> 74	—	—	—
* ff. 32-42 ^v <i>s.</i> 341	art. 9	ff. 7-10 ^v	ff. 169-174 ^v
<i>Lyon</i> <i>BM 604</i>			
* ff. 34-41 ^v / lost part / ff. 42-57 ^v <i>s.</i> 2, 1-9 (ending in <i>quia non est</i> <i>iustificatus</i>) + <i>s.</i> 9, 3-21	art. 5 <i>s.</i> 2, 1-9 (ending in <i>quia non est</i> <i>iustificatus</i>) + <i>s.</i> 9, 3-21	ff. 103-109 ^v <i>s.</i> 2, 1-9 (ending in <i>quia non est</i> <i>iustificatus</i>) + <i>s.</i> 9, 3-21	ff. 255/256- 259/260 <i>s.</i> 2, 1-9 (ending two sentences earlier than in <i>L</i> : <i>defuit illi</i> <i>operandi tempus</i>)
* ff. 57 ^v -67 <i>s.</i> 170	art. 7	ff. 86-89 ^v	ff. 184 ^v /185 ^v - 189/190
* ff. 67-68 / lost part / 68-69 ^v / lost part / 70-72 ^v / lost part / 73-74 <i>s.</i> Wilmart 11, 1 + 3-5 + 6-10 + 12-14	—	ff. 109 ^v -112 <i>s.</i> Wilmart 11, 1 + 3-5 + 6-10 + 12-14	ff. 189/190- 193/194 <i>s.</i> Wilmart 11, 1 + 3-5 + 6-10 + 12-14
* ff. 74-88 <i>s.</i> 361	—	—	—

Although the above observations concerning the position of the Wilmart fragment in *L* could be the result of a mere coincidence, they more likely imply that someone who possessed a *vd* version of §§1-5 and a *q* version of at least §§6-14 (i.e., without §§6b-10a), discovered that the mutilated manuscript *L* or one of its descendants offered a further fragment that had to be inserted somewhere between the last words on f. 69^v of *L* (§5; p. 698, l. 18: [...] *intrate per angustiam*) and the first words on f. 73 (§12; p. 703, l. 26: *quare non aemulatur* [...]). The latter alternative would imply that *L* or a descendant was

one of three sources that were used for a reconstruction of *s.* 142. This reconstruction may have been produced at an early date, but has come down to us in a rather late manuscript belonging to a very specific branch of *vd* (*V*). Moreover, if one sticks to Wilmart's conviction that the added fragment, which he discovered in *V*, belonged to a more original form of *s.* 142 than the form preserved in the Maurist edition – I believe with Morin³¹ that there is no reason to doubt this – opting for the second alternative would mean that the fragment absent from *q* was probably even larger than the one published by Wilmart and Morin. Another implication would be that the position of the Wilmart fragment within *s.* 142 as offered by *V* does not necessarily coincide with the fragment's original position, for *L* and its descendants did/do not contain any precise information about the fragment's original position between the last words on f. 69^v of *L* and the first words on f. 73. The compiler of the version preserved in *V* could thus have decided by himself where to insert the fragment in what *vd* and *q* had preserved of the sermon's text between p. 698, l. 18 and p. 703, l. 26 of Morin's edition.

Previous research has concluded that for several of its items the 'Collection de Lyon' is closely related with the 'Collection de Marmoutier'. In these cases, the latter collection offers a text that is very similar to, but independent of that of the 7th-century codex from Lyon. Luc De Coninck puts it as follows: 'En plus du n° 12 [= *s.* 60], les n°s 9 (*serm.* 9), 10 (*serm.* 142), 14 (*serm.* 22) et 16 (*app.* 65), ainsi que le n° 17 (*app.* 144), réapparaissent dans *F* [= De Coninck's *siglum* for the representatives of the 'Collection de Lyon'] sous le même titre (qui est plus d'une fois typiquement césarien); pour autant qu'il existe des éditions critiques confrontant les deux témoins (éd. LAMBOT, 1961 [= *CCSL* 41], 100-101. 287), on constate que leurs textes sont à peu près identiques sans que le ms. tourangeau [= *M*] dépende de *F*.'³² The close link between both collections is very clear in the case of *s.* 142. Manuscript *M* shares the following characteristics with *L* against *vd*, *q* and *V*: (1) The sermon bears the same title in *M* and *L*: *Incipit de eo quod in Christo, qui uia est, omnia possideat christianus, si mitis sit* [sit *om.* *M*] *et humilis corde* [fuerit *add.* *M*]. (2) Although their text of §§1-5 clearly belongs to the same tradition as the *q*

³¹ See MA 1, p. 694: *Quae etsi in utraque recensione «De uerbis Domini» et «Quinquaginta homiliarum» desiderantur, prorsus et Augustinianas eas esse, et ad eundem sermonem pertinere, Andreas noster argumentis nihil dubii relinquentibus ostendit.*

³² See L. DE CONINCK (2008), XXXIII.

sources quoted in the critical apparatus of Morin,³³ they also share variant readings and omissions that are encountered neither in *V* nor in the *vd* or *q* witnesses used by Morin.³⁴ (3) Paragraphs 13-14 (p. 704, l. 1-p. 705, l. 24) in *L* and *M* are an abbreviated version of the sermon's text as it is preserved in *q* and manuscript *V*.³⁵ The greatest difference between *L* and *M* consists in the fact that the latter's text of s. 142 has not been affected by a loss of folia and thus seems to give a better idea of the situation in the youngest common source of both manuscripts. Now, if we look at the way in which the Wilmart fragment has been transmitted in *M*, the suggestions made above on the basis of the fragment's presence in *L* seem to be confirmed: not only is the fragment preceded and followed by a few unedited sentences that smoothly link it with its surrounding context (cf. below), but it also figures at a slightly different place within what *vd* and *q* have preserved of the sermon's text between p. 698, l. 18 and p. 703, l. 26 of Morin's edition.

What follows is an edition of the new, extended version of

³³ The *q* sources used by Morin were *Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Phillips 1677* (*X*), provenance: *Collège de Clermont*, ff. 55^vff (= *P*) and *Vat. lat. 478* (*XII in.*), provenance: *San Pietro*, ff. 81^v-86^v (= *B*). Some striking similarities between *B P* and *L M* are: p. 695, ll. 21-22 *ualde-ut om. B P M* ^{a.c.}, *def. L* || p. 696, l. 1 *ad uitam om. B P M* ^{a.c.}, *def. L* || *et ipsa*] *quia et superbia B P M* ^{a.c.}, *def. L* || l. 4 *incolumis*] *fortis B P M* ^{a.c.}, *def. L* || ll. 6-7 *quam-heu om. B P M*, *def. L* || ll. 7-8 *de-sentiendo om. B P M*, *def. L* || l. 10 *corruptionesque terrenas*] *corruptionemque terrenam B P M*, *def. L* || *accedere om. B P M*, *def. L* || ll. 10-11 *hoc est fornicari*] *fornicari est B P M*, *def. L* || ll. 11-12 *huic-consilium*] *om. B P M* ^{a.c.} (*uideamus nunc obiurgationis consilium etiam post correctionem om. M*), *def. L*, *sequuntur in P M sententiae quae habentur in PL 38*, c. 779, ll. 8-12 || l. 13 *confusionem*] *confessionem B P M* ^{a.c.}, *def. L* || l. 14 *praesumptionem om. B P M*, *def. L* || l. 22 *et om. B P L M* || l. 24 *anima*] *om. B P L M* || l. 25 *sic om. B P L M* || p. 697, l. 1 *ideo om. B P L M* || l. 6 *deus*] *et amandus est deus add. B P L M* || *pro amore eius om. B P L M* || l. 9 *ergo*] *et add. B P L M* || *et quia om. B P L M* || l. 14 *orare*] *an pro illa add. B P L M* || ll. 14/15 *ignominia*] *aduersarius apparet inimicus apparet audi quod sequitur et uide utrum orare (putari L M) possit amicus add. B P L M* || etc.

³⁴ p. 695, l. 8 *ubi uis*] *ire ubi add. L M* ^{a.c.} || ll. 14-15 *quid²-tunc om. L M* ^{a.c.} || p. 697, l. 3 *minus*] *minor L M* || l. 5 *minus¹*] *est add. L M* || l. 18 *et odit¹ ante odit¹ L M* ^{a.c.} || l. 21 *deus*] *hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam add. L M* || l. 24 *audi potius*] *potius audi L M* || l. 28 *est enim*] *enim est L M* || p. 698, l. 1 *faciem*] *qui praem. L M* || ll. 2-3 *quo²-illo om. L M* || l. 3 *loco continetur*] *continetur loco L M* || l. 6 *superbia*] *homo praem. L M* || l. 10 *tumens*] *tumescens L M* ^{a.c.} || l. 11 *autem om. L M*

³⁵ p. 704, ll. 10-11 *quandoquidem-dicens*] *secundum illud L M* || 12-14 *et-me²*] *et reliqua L M* || l. 15 *et-nonne*] *iam L M* || ll. 17-18 *potest-corde om. L M* || l. 19 *si-audi om. L M* || ll. 22-28 *his-ex om. L M* || p. 704, l. 28-p. 705, l. 1 *haec-passionis*] *omnia sua reliquerunt et L M* || l. 1-15 *cum-prodest om. L M*

Wilmart's fragment within its changed surrounding context. The fragment is edited on the basis of *L*, *M* and *V*; the unedited sentences surrounding the fragment (printed in bold) are edited on the basis of *M*; the text that immediately precedes and follows the new sentences in §§6 and 10 (printed between brackets) is borrowed from Morin's edition. The critical apparatus is exhaustive, but does not mention insignificant variant readings. The Wilmart fragment (including the new sentences) now starts much earlier in §6 (after *MA* 1, p. 699, ll. 7-11 *non haec nos-possis omnia possidere* = ll. 1-5 of the new edition) and is immediately followed by 10 lines that still belonged to §6a in *V* and the editions of Wilmart and Morin (*MA* 1, p. 699, ll. 11-20 *ipse ergo medicus-in me habebis* = ll. 103-113 of the new edition). This means that, in the new edition, these 10 lines have shifted from §6 to §10.

Conspectus siglorum

- L* Lyon Bibl. Mun. 604 (VII), provenance: Lyon Cathedral, ff. 67-74
M Tours Bibl. Mun. 279 (IX ex.), provenance: Marmoutier, ff. 135-138^v
V Vaticanus latinus 471 (XII), origin: Bellevaux, ff. 148^v-152
Wilmart *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 9 (1928), pp. 285-288
Morin *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 1 (Roma 1930), pp. 695-705

6. {Non haec nos quasi ratiocinando dicimus. Ipsum audi apostolum dicentem: *Qui Filio proprio non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum, quomodo non et cum illo omnia nobis donauit?* Auare, ecce habes omnia. Omnia quae amas ut impediaris a Christo, contemne et ipsum tene in quo possis omnia possidere.}

Forte nolis illud atque illud: quaecumque desiderantur terrena; iam non es auarus. Aliter tecum loquendum est. Est in te aliqua pietas; negligere coepisti mundana; non credis posse sufficere tibi nisi Deum. « Vtquid habebō omnia », dicis, « si illum non habuero? » Recte dicis. Sed si et ipsum uis habere, audi quod sequitur. Cum enim dixisset: *Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo* – tamquam exhortans et dicens: « Veni ad me, si uis omnia possidere » – et ne tu diceres: « Nolo omnia, sed eum uolo qui fecit omnia », sequitur et dicit: *Nemo nouit Filium nisi Pater et nemo nouit Patrem nisi Filius* – noli desperare, audi cetera: *et cui uoluerit Filius reuelare.* « Cui uoluerit, inquit: mihi forte nolit. » Non ueniret ad te humilis, si tibi nollet innotescere excelsus.

Forte et hic dicis: « Etiam ipse mihi innotescit, Patrem uelim discere. » Patrem uis nosse? Audi uocem Philippi; prior nuntiauit

2–4 Rom. 8, 32 11 Matth. 11, 27 14–16 Matth. 11, 27

1–5 Non...possidere] *ex editione G. Morin (MA 1, p. 699, ll. 7–11)*
 6–9 Forte...Deum] *ex M, def. L, om. V Wilmart Morin* 6 nolis] *noles M^{a.c.}*
 8 credis] *credes M^{a.c.}* 9 habebō] *habeo L^{a.c.}* 10 Sed] *om. V* 13 et] *del. M*
 17 nollet] *nolit L, nollit M^{a.c.}* 18 Etiam] *si add. V* | innotescit] *innotescet M^{p.c.}, innotescat V* | uelim] *uellim L M* 19 Philippi] *Phylippi M V* | nuntiauit] *enuntiauit M^{p.c.}*

20 hanc uocem et optime, ut decebat, sentiebat beatitudinem et ubique
 etiam sitiens, ubique sitiens remanebat: nusquam inueniebat unde
 satiaretur. Ait Domino sitiens: *Domine, ostende nobis Patrem et*
sufficit nobis. Quid est *sufficit nobis*? Ibi requiescens amplius non
 requiram. Et Dominus: *Tanto tempore uobiscum sum et non*
 25 *cognouistis me? Philippe, qui me uidit, uidit et Patrem*. Hoc ergo
 opus est ut ostendat se Filius. Non enim minorem Patre inuenturus
 es Filium aut frustra dixit: *Ego et Pater unum sumus*. Sed qui in se
 unum cum Patre, propter te tamen *semetipsum exinaniuit formam*
serui accipiens. Quod *semetipsum exinaniuit formam serui*
 30 *accipiens*, donauit hoc tibi auerso a se; conuerso autem ad se
 seruauit tibi *Ego et Pater unum sumus*.

7. Et uide quomodo aperte hoc dicat: *Qui diligit me, mandata mea*
custodit et diligitur a Patre meo et ego diligam eum. Suspendit
 nos, quasi quid daturus, quia diligit nos. Quomodo si tibi homo
 35 dicat: « Diligo te », non attendis nisi quid tibi donet, quid tibi
 praestet, quid possit in quo sit utilis. Ait ergo Dominus: *et ego*
diligam eum. Quaere quid tibi daturus sit. Audi quod sequitur: *et*
ostendam ei me ipsum. Quid est hoc, fratres? Videtis quo rapiat

22–23 Ioh. 14, 8 24–25 Ioh. 14, 9 27 Ioh. 10, 30 28–30 Phil. 2, 7 31
 Ioh. 10, 30 32–33 Ioh. 14, 21 36–38 Ioh. 14, 21

20 et¹... beatitudinem] *secutus sum interpunctionem codicis L* (et optime ut (ut
del. M) dicebat; sentiebat (sitiebat *M^{p.c.}*) beatitudinem *M*, et optime, ut decebat.
 Sitiebat enim beatitudinem *V* | ut] *del. M* | decebat] dicebat *M* | sentiebat]
 sitiebat *M^{p.c.}* *V*, enim *add. V* 21 etiam] *eam M^{p.c.}* *V* | sitiens¹] quaerens
V | sitiens²] *M^{e corr.}* (fortasse sentiens *M^{a.c.}*) 25 cognouistis] cognouisti *M*
p.c. | me¹] *M^{e corr.}* | Philippe] Phylippe *V* | uidit uidit] uidet uidet *V*
 29–30 Quod... accipiens] *om. per homoeot. M* 32 quomodo] quam *V*
 33 custodit] custodet *M^{a.c.}* | et¹] qui autem diligit me *V* 35 attendis] adtendes
M^{a.c.} 36 possit] prosit *V* | et] *om. M*

flamma caritatis. Visuri sumus aliquid et ipsum aliquid Verbum
 40 Dei est et ipsum aliquid Deus apud Deum, per quem facta sunt
 omnia. Munus enuntiatur, munus proponitur. Quanta hominum et
 quam uana laetitia! Feruet undique tumultus concursantium,
 indicantium sibi quasi magnum aliquid, excitantium se hortatione
 et nugatoriis blandimentis ire, uidere. Quo ire? Quid uidere? Quo
 45 corrupta anima pergat redeatque corruptior et indigna amplexu
 tamquam legitimi uiri sui, illuc itur, illuc curritur. Et proponit
 futuram quandam uisionem, futuram exspectationem Christus.
 Dicit: « *Ego diligam eum et ostendam* – non quod feci, non sinum
 altissimum abyssorum, non secreta terrarum, non uarietates
 50 herbarum, non multitudinem generum animalium, non postremo
 numerum siderum, non conuersiones astrorum, non dimensiones
 temporum. Utquid enim haec uis uidere? Quae si uideres, certe
 magna essent: ego feci haec – *ostendam me ipsum illi.* »

8. « Sed quando istud erit », dicit aliquis, « quando ostendet? »
 55 Differt, non aufert. « Et in differendo quid agit? » Desiderio dilatat
 sinum animae. Magnum quiddam daturus est, fratres, et quid dico
 uel magnum? Si uel hoc dicendum est! Vide quanta dat impiis,
 quanta dat et donat indignis. Quare et ipsis? Quia *facit solem suum*

48 Ioh. 14, 21 53 Ioh. 14, 21 58–59 Matth. 5, 45

39 et...aliquid²] *del. M* 44 Quid] quod *M^{a.c.}* 46 tamquam] tam *V* | curritur]
 curretur *M^{a.c.}* | Et] *legere nequeo quod add. s. lin. M^{p.c.}* 48 Dicit] enim *add.*
V | Ego] *om. V* | ostendam] ei *add. V* 49 altissimum] *om. V*
 50 multitudinem... animalium] *ita V*, (in *M^{a.c.}*) multitudinum genera animalium
L M^{a.c.}, uim seminum non genera animalium *M^{p.c.}* 53 essent] non *praem.*
V | me] *om. L^{a.c.}* 54 ostendet] ostendit *L M^{a.c.}* 57 Si] quasi *M^{p.c.}* | Vide]
 uidete *M^{p.c.} V* | impiis] *iterat M^{a.c.}* 58 quanta] et *praem. V* | dat et] *ita L*,
 dona et *M^{a.c.}*, *om. M^{p.c.} V* | Quare] quae donat *M^{p.c.}* | Quia] *del. M*

oriri super bonos et malos. Videte quemadmodum seruiat creatura
 blasphemis; ipsa naturalia dona circumspecte. Habent salutem,
 habent integritatem sensuum, habent spiritum membra terrena
 uegetantem, habent perfunctionem aeris huius, uisionem lucis,
 rationabilem mentem, qua ceteris animantibus excellentiores sunt.
 Haec omnia diuitibus, pauperibus, bonis, malis tamquam diuitiae
 communes iacent. Aluntur omnes, illustrantur ista luce omnes,
 tamquam de publico uiuunt. Dat haec omnia. Hinc, fratres, cogitare
 non debemus quid seruet suis, quid praeparet fidelibus, ut uideant
 non uidentes et credentes? Credere antequam uideas, meritum est
 futurae uisionis. Exercetur ergo capacitas tua dilatione bonorum, ut
 aucto desiderio sis idoneus capere quod promittit et quod desideras.
 9. Nam aliquid iam dedit: dedit enim pignus Spiritum suum. Quid
 est: « pignus dedit »? Tamquam dicens: « Ecce quia dabo aliquid,
 inde nunc do quod te erigat, quod inflammet caritatem, quod rapiat
 ad satietatem gustatum ». *Gustate et uidete quam suavis est*
Dominus. Vnde gustastis, inde satiabimini. *Inebriabuntur*, inquit,
ab ubertate domus tuae et reliqua. *Quoniam apud te est fons uitae*
et in lumine tuo uidebimus lumen. Numquid aliud fons uitae et
 aliud lumen? Multis modis dicitur quod, quicquid dictum fuerit,
 non dicetur. Ergo erigamur, inflammemur, inardescamus,

74–75 Ps. 33, 9 75–77 Ps. 35, 9–10

59 Videte] uide *V* 63 sunt] *non leg. L*, *simus M* (*ut uid.*) 64 Haec] *M^e corr.*
 66 tamquam] *tam L^{a.c.}* | uiuunt] *ui*uunt L^{a.c.}* | omnia] *omnibus M^{p.c.}*
 67 debemus] *debe* M* 67–68 ut...credentes] *non uidentibus et credentibus ut*
uideant M^{p.c.} 70 aucto] *auto M^{a.c.}*, *aucta V* 71–72 Quid est] *del. M*
 74 gustatum] *ante rapiat V* 75 gustastis] *gustatis M* 76 et reliqua] *non leg. M*
a.c., et torrente uoluptatis tuae potabis eos *M^{p.c.}* 78 dictum] *dixum M* 79 dicetur]
dicitur M^{p.c.} | inflammemur] *M^e corr.*

80 desideremus. Et si differimur, non auferemur. Teneamus tantum
 uiam: ibi erit satietas nostra, ibi erit fons uitae. Venit ipse fons
 uitae, indutus est carne, fecit ut desideremus. Praestitit indignis
 mortem suam, seruat dignis uitam suam.

10. Sed quia, ut diximus, fratres, tumore superbiae non redibamus,
 85 inde indignis praestitit mortem suam: humilis factus est, ut
 humiliaret superbos; humilis factus est, ut exaltaretur excelsus. Hoc
 egit, ut detumesceret morbus tuus. Tumentes uolebant intrare
 discipuli illi duo, qui per matrem – quia per se non audebant –
 90 rogauerunt. Vel ipsa uerecundia debuit monere quid peterent. Non
 audebant per se: anum matrem suam ueluti emeritae aetatis
 fecerunt loqui ad Dominum. Desiderabant regnum, quo non intratur
 nisi per iter angustum. Illi autem tumentes adhuc cupiditate honoris
 quanto se artius impellebant, tanto grauius uexabantur. Deprimit
 eos Dominus et dat calicem amarum, de quo paulo ante locutus
 95 sum, contra tumorem, **qui non permittit intrare per iter
 angustum. Ait eis: Potestis bibere calicem? Non dixit: « calicem
 amarum », « calicem tribulationis ». Si ista diceret, ante
 deterreret quam inuitaret. Potestis, inquit, calicem bibere? Iam
 auersabantur, horrebant. Quomodo inuitauit? Adiecit: « quem**

96 Matth. 20, 22 98–100 Matth. 20, 22

80 desideremus] desideramus *M^{a.c.}* | si] *om. M^{a.c.}* | auferemur] auferimur *M*
 V 81–82 Venit... uitae] *om. per homoeot. M* 86 humiliaret...ut] *om. per*
homoeot. V 90 audebant] audebat *M^{a.c.}* 91 regnum] regnum *M^{a.c.}*
 92 honoris] honores *M^{a.c.}* 93 Deprimit] deprimet *L*, deprimebat *M*
 93–94 Deprimit eos] deprimebatur *M^{a.c.}* (*ut uid.*) 95–103 qui...medicina] *ex*
M, *def. L*, *om. V* Wilmart Morin 95 intrare per] *aliquid erasum est inter uerba*
intrare et per in codice M 97 tribulationis] tribulationes *M^{a.c.}* | diceret]
 dicerit *M^{a.c.}* 99 auersabantur] uersabantur *M^{a.c.}*

100 *ego bibiturus sum. Vos certe in aliquo tumore estis aut in magno; ego in nullo. Tota et perfecta sanitas ubi nulla peccata. Et quanto perfectior sanitas, tanto solidior et certior medicina.* » {Ipse ergo medicus nihil tali indigens medicamento, tamen ut exhortaretur aegrotum, bibit quod opus non erat; tamquam
105 alloquens recusantem et trepidum erigens bibit prior. « *Calicem* », inquit, « *quem ego bibiturus sum*. Qui in me non habeo quod ab illo calice sanetur, bibiturus sum tamen, ne tu dedigneris bibere, cui opus est ut bibas. » }

Iam uidete, fratres, si amplius debet aegrotare genus humanum
110 accepta tanta medicina. Iam humilis Deus et adhuc superbus homo. Audiatur, discatur! « *Omnia* », inquit, « *mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo*. Si desideras omnia, tecum habebis. Si desideras Patrem, per me habebis, in me habebis. » } {Dicebas: « Non possum; per angustum me uocas; non possum intrare per angustum. » « *Venite ad me* », 115 inquit, « *omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis*. Sarcina uobis tumor uester est. *Venite ad me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis et ego uos reficiam. Tollite iugum meum super uos et discite a me.* » }

105–106 Matth. 20, 22 111 Matth. 11, 27 114–117 Matth. 11, 28–29

103–113 Ipse...habebis] *ex editione G. Morin (MA 1, p. 699, ll. 11–20)*
113–117 Dicebas...me] *ex editione G. Morin (MA 1, p. 702, ll. 8–12)*

The Wilmart fragment within its new context

I will now try to prove on the basis of a content analysis of §§5-10 that the text of *s.* 142 in the youngest common source of *L*, *M* and *V* did contain the sentences that I have added on the basis of codex *M*, and did offer the Wilmart fragment (including the additional lines) in the same position as the latter codex does. This analysis will distinguish by means of an asterisk the line numbering of the new edition from the numbering in the Morin text.

Paragraph 5 argues that a person who is swollen with pride cannot enter through the narrow gate of God's kingdom. In order to fulfil Christ's command *Intrate per angustam portam* (Mt. 7:13), he must reduce the swelling. He can achieve this by drinking the medicine of humility, which is a bitter, but wholesome draught: *Vnde autem detumescat? Accipiat humilitatis medicamentum. Bibat contra tumorem poculum amarum, sed salubre: bibat poculum humilitatis* (MA 1, p. 698, ll. 11-13). He should not have his heart set on the things of this world nor take pride in worldly pomp. The only way to get through the narrow gate of the kingdom is Christ, who called himself the way (*ego sum uia*: Mt. 14:6) and the door (*ego sum ianua*: John 10:7).

Augustine then introduces in the second person singular someone who, driven by worldly avarice, wants to possess everything. To this person he says – I paraphrase: “If you want to possess everything, you have to turn to Christ, who says: *Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo* (Mt. 11:27a). If you are to object that the latter verse says that the Father handed over everything to Christ and not to you, listen then to the words of the Apostle.” (*Certe forte auaritia omnia uis possidere. Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo, inquit. Fortasse dicturus es: «Christo sunt tradita: numquid mihi?» Audi apostolum dicentem [...]; ll. 24-27*). The apostolic words hinted at are Rm. 5:6, according to which Christ died for the unholy, who did not deserve His love: *Etenim Christus pro impiis mortuus est*. If Christ's death was God's gift to the unholy — Augustine asks — what will be His gift to the pious? The answer runs: the possession of everything. If someone wants to have everything, he should not go about it in a greedy way, but try to achieve it in a godly way. In doing so, he will get hold of Him through whom all things were made, and with Him he will possess everything: *Quaero quid merebatur impius. «Damnari», respondes. Christus tamen pro impiis mortuus est. Ecce quid tibi praestitum est impio: iam pio quid seruat? Quid praestitum est impio? Christus pro impiis mortuus est. Desiderabas autem omnia*

possidere. Noli per auaritiam: per pietatem hoc quaere; si enim ita quaesieris, possidebis. Tenebis enim eum per quem facta sunt omnia, et cum ipso omnia possidebis (p. 699, ll. 1-6).

At the beginning of paragraph 6 Augustine claims that Rm. 8:32 confirms the above argument against the opinion that, according to Mt. 11:27a, the Father gave everything only to the Son: *Non haec nos quasi ratiocinando dicimus. Ipsum audi apostolum dicentem: Qui Filio proprio non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum, quomodo non et cum illo omnia nobis donauit?* (*ll. 1-4) This quotation of Rm. 8:32 is followed by a conclusion that repeats what is said in the previous paragraph: a greedy person who desires to possess everything, has to — paradoxically — condemn his worldly possessions and hold on to Christ, for in Christ he will find the fulfilment of his desire: *Auare, ecce habes omnia. Omnia quae amas ut impediaris a Christo, contemne et ipsum tene in quo possis omnia possidere* (*ll. 4-5).

In the editions of Wilmart and Morin, these words are immediately followed by a reflexion on Christ the healer (MA 1, p. 699, ll. 11-20 *ipse ergo medicus-in me habebis*), which in the new edition appears only on *ll. 103-113. This passage first develops the theme of the *poculum humilitatis*, which was hinted at in §5 (p. 699, ll. 11-18 *ipse ergo medicus-adhuc superbus homo*), and subsequently returns to the argument concerning the possession of everything (p. 699, ll. 18-20 *audiat discat omnia-in me habebis*). In the editions of Wilmart and Morin, the Wilmart fragment then further develops the latter argument (p. 699, ll. 20ff. *utquid habebo omnia* [...]).

In the new version of s. Wilmart 11 the argument concerning the possession of everything is not interrupted by a reflexion on the theme of the *Christus medicus*. On the contrary, Augustine further develops the argument by giving it more complexity. After having spoken to a worldly *auarus*, who wants to possess everything and paradoxically can only find fulfilment of his desire by holding on to Christ, Augustine now turns to another second person singular, who is no *auarus* anymore, but has given up all worldly desires. The introduction of this new second person singular is marked by the same adverb (*forte*) as the introduction of the worldly *auarus* in §5 (*Forte nolis illud atque illud: quaecumque desiderantur terrena; iam non es auarus*; *ll. 6-7). To such a person, Augustine has to speak differently (*Aliter tecum loquendum est*; *l. 7), because for someone who believes that only God can fulfil his desire (*Est in te aliqua pietas; neglegere coepisti mundana; non credis posse sufficere tibi nisi Deum*; *ll. 7-9), the possession of everything — and here the Wilmart

fragment starts — is of no use, if he does not possess God himself («*Vtquid habebō omnia*», *dicis*, «*si illum non habuero?*»; *Il. 9-10). Whereas the possession of everything, which could seduce an *auarus* to give up his worldly desires, was guaranteed in §5 and at the beginning of §6 by the combination of Mt. 11:27a, Rm. 5:6 and Rm. 8:32, the possession of God is now presented as the implicit promise of Mt. 11:27b: *Cum enim dixisset*: *Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo — tamquam exhortans et dicens*: «*Veni ad me, si uis omnia possidere*» — *et ne tu dicerēs*: «*Nolo omnia, sed eum uolo qui fecit omnia*», *sequitur et dicit*: *Nemo nouit Filium nisi Pater et nemo nouit Patrem nisi Filius — noli desperare, audi cetera*: et cui uoluerit Filius reuelare (*Il. 11-16).

Augustine subsequently argues that the one who knows the Son, also knows the Father (John 14:8-9; *Il. 18-26), and that the Son and the Father are one (John 10:30; *Il. 26-27). In spite of His being one with the Father, the Son emptied Himself and took on the form of a servant (Phil. 2:7; *Il. 27-30). This was the gift He made when man was turned away from Him; the contemplation of the unity of the Son and the Father will be His gift to those who return to Him (*Il. 30-31). This reflexion gives rise in §7 to an evocation of this future contemplation, which, in turn, leads to an explanation in §8 of why God postpones this future delight. Paragraph 9 states that man has received God's Spirit as a deposit, which enflames his desire while the unspeakable vision of God is still absent.

At the beginning of §10 Augustine returns to the *tumor* of pride spoken of in §5. Christ came down low in humility, the bishop claims, in order that the swelling, which prevented man's return to Him, might deflate (*Sed quia, ut diximus, fratres, tumore superbiae non redibamus, inde indignis praestitit mortem suam: humilis factus est, ut humiliaret superbos; humilis factus est, ut exaltaretur excelsus. Hoc egit, ut detumesceret morbus tuus*, *Il. 84-87). In this way Augustine reintroduces the *Christus medicus* theme, which in the new edition has not been hinted at since the mention of the *humilitatis medicamentum*, the *poculum amarum, sed salubre* and the *poculum humilitatis* in §5 (MA 1, p. 698, ll. 12-13). Another theme of §5 — the idea that swollen pride prevents us from entering the kingdom — is subsequently taken up in a paraphrase of Mt. 20:20-23. Zebedeus' two sons wanted to enter the kingdom, but pride prevented them from passing through its small entry. In an explicit reference to §5, the last sentence of the Wilmart fragment states that Christ healed both brothers by offering them a bitter cup against the swelling: *Desiderabant regnum, quo non intratur nisi per iter angustum. Illi autem tumentes*

*adhuc cupiditate honoris quanto se artius impellebant, tanto grauius uexabantur. Deprimit eos Dominus et dat calicem amarum, de quo paulo ante locutus sum, contra tumorem, [...] (*ll. 91-96).*

The last sentence of the Wilmart fragment not only hints at the *poculum amarum, sed salubre* of §5 and the expression *bibat poculum humilitatis* in the same paragraph, it is also a reminiscence of Christ's question to Zebedeus' sons in Mt. 20:22: *Potestis calicem bibere quem ego bibiturus sum?* In this way, it does not come as a surprise that the new sentences that the above edition adds to the Wilmart fragment and that carry the mark of Augustine's homiletic style, embroider further on this very question. Christ did not say — Augustine typically claims — that both brothers had to drink from a bitter cup (*Non dixit: «calicem amarum», «calicem tribulationis»; *ll. 96-97*). Such a statement would have repelled them (*Si ista diceret, ante deterreret quam inuitaret; *ll. 97-98*). The main clause of Christ's question already made them shiver (*Potestis, inquit, calicem bibere? Iam auersabantur, horrebant; *ll. 98-99*), but the added relative clause was meant to give them confidence (*Quomodo inuitauit? Adiecit: quem ego bibiturus sum; *ll. 99-100*).³⁶ Moreover, while they had to drink from the bitter cup as a medicine against the illness of pride, Christ was to drink from it in perfect health (*Vos certe in aliquo tumore estis aut in magno; ego in nullo. Tota et perfecta sanitas ubi nulla peccata. Et quanto perfectior sanitas, tanto solidior et certior medicina; *ll. 100-103*). The lines, which immediately precede the Wilmart fragment in the editions of Wilmart and Morin (*MA 1, p. 699, ll. 11-20 ipse ergo medicus-in me habebis*), but which immediately follow the new sentences that complete the fragment in our edition (*ll. 103-113), clearly presuppose the exposition on

³⁶ Clear parallels to the interpretation of Mt. 20:22 in s. Wilmart 11, 10 are s. 20A, 8 (CCSL 41, p. 272, ll. 121-135: *Sed timebas tu, o homo, contumelias humilitatis pati! Bibere calicem passionis amarissimum prodest tibi. Viscera tua tument, inflata habes praecordia. Bibe amaritudinem, ut teneas sanitatem. Bibit sanus medicus. Non uult bibere languens aegrotus? Hoc enim filiis Zebedei ait: Potestis bibere calicem? Non illis dixit: «Potestis bibere calicem contumeliarum, calicem fellis, calicem aceti, calicem amarissimum, calicem ueneno repletum, calicem omnium passionum?» Si haec diceret, terreret potius quam excitaret. Vbi communicatio, ibi consolatio. Quid dedignaris, serue? Calicem illum Dominus bibit. Quid dedignaris, aegrote? Medicus bibit. Quid dedignaris, languide? Sanus bibit. Potestis bibere calicem quem ego bibiturus sum? Tunc illi auidi altitudinis, nescientes quid possent, promittentes quod nondum haberent: Possumus, dixerunt) and s. 329, 2 (PL 38, c. 1455). For the theme of the *medicus humilis* who first drank the 'cup of humility' in order to encourage those suffering from the illness of pride, see R. ARBESMANN (1954), 14-16 (with further Augustinian examples).*

Zebedeus' sons: they explicitly quote the comforting relative clause of Mt. 20:22 and state that Christ, who did not need a medicine, drank it in order to persuade those who need(ed) to drink it, but were/are reluctant to do so: *Ipse ergo medicus nihil tali indigens medicamento, tamen ut exhortaretur aegrotum, bibit quod opus non erat; tamquam alloquens recusantem et trepidum erigens bibit prior. «Calicem», inquit, «quem ego bibiturus sum. Qui in me non habeo quod ab illo calice sanetur, bibiturus sum tamen, ne tu dedigneris bibere, cui opus est ut bibas.»* (*ll. 103-108) Moreover, these lines are concluded by a new reference to Mt. 11:27a (*Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo*) (*ll. 109-113 *iam uidete fratres-in me habebis*), which is now smoothly continued by a quotation of Mt. 11, 28-29 (*ll. 113-117), which in the editions of Wilmart and Morin was separated from the reference to verse 27a by the long Wilmart fragment (MA 1, p. 702, ll. 8ff. *dicebas non possum [...]*).

The foregoing content analysis demonstrates that the new edition of §§6-10 is well structured and that, considered in the light of this new text, the sermon's argument in Wilmart's and Morin's editions is less clear, especially in §6. Together with what has been said above concerning the sermon's transmission, this observation sufficiently proves — I think — that the above edition of §§6-10 reflects the situation in the youngest common source of manuscripts *L*, *M* and *V*.

I am aware of the fact that *M* belongs to the so-called Arlesian collections and may thus offer us a (Caesarian?) adaptation of the original version of Augustine's *s.* 142. The same, however, goes for *L* and the Wilmart fragment in manuscript *V*. So even if *M* contains a (Caesarian?) adaptation of an unknown Augustinian original, we still need to acknowledge that of all extant witnesses, *M* offers the most original version of the Wilmart fragment and its surrounding context. Moreover, since there seems to be no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Wilmart fragment as a whole — no one has ever done so since its first publication in 1928³⁷ — the new sentences as well as the fragment's new position have every chance of being Augustinian too. Several typically Augustinian features in the new sentences support this conclusion: the image of the *calix tribulationis* (*l. 97),³⁸ the analysis of Mt. 20:22 (with inclusion of the formulas *non dixit* and *si*

³⁷ Compare G. Morin's words as quoted in n. 31.

³⁸ From the *Library of Latin Texts*, it seems that the expression *calix/calic* tribulationis/tribulationum* was first used by Augustine (*s.* 88, 7). For Augustine's use of the word *calix*, see also V. SAXER (1986-1994), 707-708.

ista diceret; *ll. 96-100),³⁹ the combination of parallelism and antithesis (*ll. 100-103), etc.

Conclusion

This article has presented a new critical edition of §§6-10 of saint Augustine's s. 142, which is based in the first place on the 'Collection de Marmoutier' (*M*). This collection presents the fragment that Wilmart added in 1928 to the Maurist edition, at a slightly different place than Wilmart's sole witness did, viz. *Vat. lat.* 471 (*V*). Moreover, in *M* the fragment is preceded and followed by several authentic sentences that are lacking in *V* and have remained unedited until today. My acceptance of these supplementary lines was based on arguments drawn from the sermon's global transmission as well as from the content and structure of the sermon's paragraphs 5-10. I would like to stress at the end of this article that arguments such as these are absolutely necessary for the acceptance of additional lines discovered in *M*, since Cyril Lambot and Luc De Coninck have demonstrated in the introductions to their editions of ss. 70, 254 and 343 that *M* shows traces of intentional manipulation and has to be used with caution.⁴⁰

The present article has also shed further light on the transmission of s. 142. The sermon was known in different forms during the early Middle Ages. It was transmitted with a *post sermonem* on the burial of catechumens (s. Dolbeau 7) within the so-called 'Collection de Lorsch', the history of which has been described in detail by François Dolbeau.⁴¹ Without the *post sermonem*, it also circulated in several abbreviated forms: (1) the early medieval collection *De uerbis Domini* contained §§1-5; (2) the Arlesian *Quinquaginta homiliae* transmitted the whole without the fragment that was first published by Wilmart; (3) the acquainted Arlesian collections of Lyon and Marmoutier had preserved the latter fragment, but offered an abbreviated version of §§13-14.⁴² Since the sole representative of the 'Collection

³⁹ Compare the parallels given in n. 36.

⁴⁰ See C. LAMBOT (1956), 24-25 (s. 343); (1969b), 57-60 (s. 254); L. DE CONINCK (2008), XXXIII and 467 (s. 70).

⁴¹ See F. DOLBEAU (1996b), 43-46.

⁴² If the *Quinquaginta homiliae* and the collections of Lyon and Marmoutier were composed by Caesarius, as is often stated, one might presume that versions 2 and 3 of s. 142 constitute two separate branches, which ultimately depend on an identical Arlesian source, which contained a complete version of the sermon.

de Lyon' has lost several of the folia that originally contained s. 142 (*Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604, ff. 67-74), the 'Collection de Marmoutier' has best preserved this third abbreviated version of the sermon.

In the 12th century at the latest — but it could have been much earlier — a reconstruction of s. 142 was made on the basis of a *De uerbis Domini* source (§§1-5) and a representative of the *Quinquaginta homiliae* (second half of the sermon without the Wilmart fragment). Its editor also inserted the text of the Wilmart fragment as it was preserved on the ff. 70-72^v of *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604 or in one of its descendants, but he did this at a place that was slightly different from the fragment's position in the sermon's original form. If the reconstruction directly depends on *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604 and not on one of its descendants, it is quite probable that it was produced at Lyon, since *Lyon Bibl. Mun.* 604 belonged without any doubt to the city's Cathedral Library from the 9th century at the latest. The reconstruction was subsequently included together with several other sermons in the second redaction of an adapted and enlarged version of *De uerbis Domini*. In this second redaction, which is preserved in the 12th-century codex *Vat. lat.* 471, it replaced the sermon's *De uerbis Domini* version of s. 142 (§§1-5), which was still present in the adaptation's first redaction. It still has to be determined when and where the second redaction was compiled: did it happen in Carolingian Lyon or at a later moment, e.g. in Cluny? In an article that will be published soon, I shall propose new arguments in favour of the latter alternative.

Bibliography

- R. ARBESMANN (1954) – R. ARBESMANN, *The concept of «Christus medicus» in St. Augustine*, in: *Traditio* 10 (1954) 1-28.
- C. CHARLIER (1945) – C. CHARLIER, *Les manuscrits personnels de Florus de Lyon et son activité littéraire*, in: *Mélanges E. Podechard. Études de sciences religieuses* (Lyon 1945) 71-84.
- C. CHARLIER (1947) – C. CHARLIER, *La compilation augustinienne de Florus sur l'Apôtre. Sources et authenticité*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 57 (1947) 132-186.
- L. DE CONINCK (2006) – L. DE CONINCK-B. COPPIETERS 'T WALLANT-R. DEMEULENAERE, *La tradition manuscrite du recueil De Verbis Domini jusqu'au XII^e siècle. Prolégomènes à une édition critique des Sermones ad Populum d'Augustin d'Hippone sur les Évangiles (ss. 51 à 147)* (*Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia* 45, Turnhout 2006).

- L. DE CONINCK (2008) – *Sancti Aurelii Augustini sermones in Matthaeum*. I. Ediderunt P.-P. VERBRAKEN-L. DE CONINCK-B. COPPIETERS 'T WALLANT-R. DEMEULENAERE-F. DOLBEAU (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* 41Aa, Turnhout 2008).
- F. DOLBEAU (1996a) – *Augustin d'Hippone. Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique*. Retrouvés à Mayence, édités et commentés par F. DOLBEAU (*Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité* 147, Paris 1996).
- F. DOLBEAU (1996b) – F. DOLBEAU, *Le sermonnaire augustinien de Mayence (Mainz, Stadtbibliothek I 9): analyse et histoire*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 106 (1996) 5-52.
- R. GRYSOEN (2007) – R. GRYSOEN, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'Antiquité et du Haut Moyen Âge*. I. Introduction. Répertoire des auteurs: A-H (*Vetus Latina* 1.1⁵, Freiburg 2007⁵).
- E. HILL (1992) – *The Works of Saint Augustine. A Translation for the 21st Century. Sermons III/4: (94A-147A) on the New Testament*, transl. and notes by E. Hill (Brooklyn [New York] 1992).
- R. KURZ (1979) – R. KURZ, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*. Band V. Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Westberlin. 2. Verzeichnis nach Bibliotheken (*Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der lateinischen Kirchenväter* 10. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 350, Wien 1979).
- C. LAMBOT (1956) – C. LAMBOT, *Le sermon CCCXLIII de saint Augustin De Susanna et Ioseph*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 66 (1956) 20-38.
- C. LAMBOT (1961) – *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Sermones de Vetere Testamento*. Recensuit C. LAMBOT (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* 41, Turnhout 1961).
- C. LAMBOT (1969a) – C. LAMBOT, *Les manuscrits des sermons de saint Augustin utilisés par les Mauristes*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 79 (1969) 98-114.
- C. LAMBOT (1969b) – C. LAMBOT, *Sermon démembré de saint Augustin*, in: *Revue bénédictine* 79 (1969) 53-69.
- G. PARTOENS (2007) – G. PARTOENS, *Une version augmentée de la collection médiévale de sermons augustinien De uerbis Domini et Apostoli. Son importance pour la transmission de l'œuvre homilétique de l'évêque d'Hippone*, in: *Recherches augustiniennes et patristiques* 35 (2007) 189-237.
- G. PARTOENS (2008) – *Sancti Aurelii Augustini sermones in epistolas apostolicas*. I. Recensuit G. PARTOENS (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* 41Ba, Turnhout 2008).

- É. REBILLARD (1999) – É. REBILLARD, *Sermones*, in: A.D. FITZGERALD, *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids [Mich.] 1999) 773-792.
- V. SAXER (1986-1994) – V. SAXER, *Calix*, in: *Augustinus-Lexikon* 1 (1986-1994) 707-708.
- A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK (1999) – A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK, *Mannon de Saint-Oyen dans l'histoire de la transmission des textes*, in: *Revue d'histoire des textes* 29 (1999) 169-243.
- A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK (2000) – A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK, *Les manuscrits de la Charité, Cheminon et Montier-en-Argonne. Collections cisterciennes et voies de transmission des textes (IX^e-XIX^e siècles) (Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l'IRHT 59. Histoire des bibliothèques médiévales 10, Paris 2000).*
- M. VATTASSO-P. FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI (1902) – M. VATTASSO-P. FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, *Codices Vaticani latini. Tomus I. Codices 1-678 (Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codices manu scripti recensiti, Rome 1902).*
- P.-P. VERBRAKEN (1976) – P.-P. VERBRAKEN, *Études critiques sur les sermons authentiques de saint Augustin (Instrumenta patristica 12, Steenbrugge-Den Haag 1976).*
- O. VON HEINEMANN (1963) – O. VON HEINEMANN, *Die Helmstedter Handschriften. Vol. 1. Codex Guelferbytanus 1 Helmstadiensis bis 500 Helmstadiensis (Kataloge der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel. Die alte Reihe. 1.1, Frankfurt am Main 1963).*
- D. WEBER (1993) – D. WEBER, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus. Band VI. Österreich. 2. Verzeichnis nach Bibliotheken (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der lateinischen Kirchenväter 12. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 601, Wien 1993).*
- A. WILMART (1928) – A. WILMART, *Un développement inédit dans le sermon CXLII de s. Augustin*, in: *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 9 (1928) 282-290.

Gert Partoens

Literary Studies: Latin Literature

K.U. Leuven, Fac. of Arts