

Textual Notes on Augustine's "*De doctrina christiana*"

As a preliminary to the critical edition of Augustine's treatise *De doctrina Christiana* for the Vienna Corpus it seems worth while to note and defend certain changes which will be made in the Benedictine edition which has been the standard for nearly three centuries, and discuss other passages which still remain difficult or doubtful. Such passages are few, for the text of this treatise, as of Augustine's writings generally, is well preserved in a uniform tradition which reveals only minor problems.

My text is based on eleven manuscripts of the ninth century or earlier. The first stands by itself, while the others fall into two groups, as will be shown in the forthcoming edition :

- C = Leningradensis Q.v.I,3, olim Corbeiensis, fere anno 396 exscriptus, libros I II continens
- D = Parisinus 13359, olim Corbeiensis, ann. 796-810
- K = Coloniensis 74, fere ann. 805-819
- A = Monacensis 3824, olim Augustanus, ante med. s. IX
- S = Sangallensis 147, post med. s. IX
- M = Camaracensis 473, post med. s. IX
- a = consensus codicum DKASM

- P = Palatinus Vaticanus 188, s. VIII vel s. IX in.
- Q = Palatinus Vaticanus 189, s. IX in.
- E = Parisinus 2704, olim Lemovicensis, fere ann. 825-850
- T = Parisinus nov. Acq. 1595, fere ann. 825-850
- B = Bambergensis Patr. 21, olim Remensis, fere ann. 850-882
- β = consensus codicum PQETB
- b = editio Badii Parisina 1502
- l = editio theologorum Lovaniensium 1576
- m = editio Maurinorum Parisina 1680
- edd = consensum harum editionum

The first of this list, the 'vetus codex Corbeiensis' of the Benedictines, has ever since their time been recognized as one of the oldest, if not the oldest of all manuscripts containing works of Augustine. I have

elsewhere¹ attempted to show that it was probably written in Hippo, in Augustine's own scriptorium, about the year 396. It contains four works elsewhere enumerated by Augustine² as the first four written during his episcopate, the fourth of which was the portion of the *De doctrina* first published, consisting of Books I-II. The volume is a miscellany of the works published in a brief period, evidently prepared for a reader who wished to keep up to date in his collection of Augustine's writings. If this view of the book is accepted, its readings acquire unusual weight. A recognition of this fact, I believe, makes possible an improvement in the text of a few passages of Books I-II.

1. Prol. 7. Et certe illum spadonem, qui Esaiam prophetam legens non intellegebat, neque ad apostolum angelus misit, nec ei per angelum id quod non intellegebat expositum, aut divinitus in mente sine hominis ministerio revelatum est.

neque ad apostolum angelus (-os PQ ante corr.) misit βC

ad quem (quem ad M) apostolum non angelum misit instruendum α

neque apostolum ad angelum misit bl

neque ad angelum apostolum misit m

In the context Augustine is defending his undertaking, the writing of a work on Biblical interpretation. Some men may insist that they need no such guide, but depend on God for direct revelation or guidance, such as the gave to the apostles, Saint Anthony, and others. Yes, Augustine replies, but even Paul, after seeing a vision of the Lord, was sent to a man for instruction and baptism. The centurion Cornelius saw an angel who referred him to Peter for instruction (*Petro traditum imbuendum*). And the case of the Ethiopian eunuch is even clearer. No angel appeared to him, either to send him to an apostle or to explain what he did not understand, nor was there any direct revelation from God. Instead, Augustine continues, Philip was sent to explain in human (that is, uninspired) language the book which the eunuch was reading.

The required sense is given by the Leningrad codex and (with an obvious correction in PQ) by all of the beta group. The alpha manuscripts evidently went wrong. When *ad quem* was substituted (presumably by accident) for *neque ad*, the loss of sense led to further inept changes. Whether Badius and the later editors had any manuscript support for their text I cannot say. In any case it is wrong. Augustine surely did not suggest the preposterous idea of an apostle sending the eunuch to an angel.

1. *Revue Bénédictine* 69 (1959), 191-197.

2. *Retract.* 2, 1-4.

2. Prol. 8. Sicut ergo hi ea quae intellegunt produnt ceteris vel loquendo vel scribendo, ita ego quoque, si non solum ea quae intellego, sed etiam in intellegendo ea quae observent prodidero, culpari ab eis profecto non debeo.

intellego *aCPETB*, intellegant *Q* *edd.*
in intellegendo *βCA*, intellegendo *DKSM* *edd.*

The manuscripts are all but unanimous in supporting *intellego*, and the sense, I believe, is better when it is retained. The critics of Augustine's undertaking professed to understand the Bible without the aid of his book. Very well, Augustine replies, but as Christians they have the duty of teaching others what they understand, either by speaking or by writing. So I also, he argues, should not be rebuked for teaching what I understand and also the principles that all should observe in understanding the Scriptures.

The shift to *intellegant* made by *Q* and some later manuscripts (e. g. London. BM Add. 11873) makes the construction parallel to the *ea quae observent* of the next clause, but destroys the more important parallel with *ea quae intellegunt* preceding.

The loss of the preposition *in* in the manuscripts of the alpha group is an easy slip. The agreement of *C* and the beta group is decisive for its retention.

3. 1, 6. Non enim re vera in strepitu istarum duarum syllabarum (sc. ' deus ') ipse cognoscitur, sed tamen omnes Latinae linguae socios, cum aures sonus iste tetigerit, movet ad cogitandum excellentissimam quandam immortalemque naturam.

socios *codd. antiquiores b*
scios *codd. quidam recentioribus im*

Here the Louvain and Benedictine editors stand against all the manuscripts older than the twelfth century, unless one has eluded me in my search of the catalogues. The tenth century London. BM Add. 11873 originally had *socios*, and the first *o* has been erased, at a date which cannot be ascertained. The first extant witness for *scios* seems to be Clm. 10048 of the twelfth century. That reading appears also in Florence, Bibl. Laur. Plut. 13 dext. 5, of the thirteenth century, and doubtless in other later manuscripts.

As the harder reading, *scios* seems to command instant favor. Though a rare word, it makes good sense, and is thus difficult to explain as an accidental slip. But the agreement of *C* with all extant manuscripts written before 1100 seems to me to settle the question. The archetype in Hippo must have read *socios*. Or if an original *scios* was immediately corrupted, how was it preserved to reappear seven hundred years later?

Through the courtesy of Professor Bernhard Bischoff and an unnamed student of his I am informed that the files of the Thesaurus in Munich

show no other instance of the word *sciūs* in Augustine. It appears once in the Latin Bible to describe a man of understanding (LXX ἐπι-στήμων) who can appreciate a wise saying (Eccli. 21, 18). Macrobius uses it to describe Lucilius as a man especially skilled in the Latin language (*vir adprime linguae Latinae sciūs*; Sat. 6, 9, 11). Neither passage seems quite to justify the choice of *sciūs* to describe all who know Latin; *sociūs*, however, would refer not to men of special understanding or skill, but to all who share in the use of Latin³.

As for the origin of the variant reading, is it not possible that some copyist recalled the words of Macrobius 'Latnaei linguae sciūs' as he reached this point in Augustine, and ventured to make a pseudo-learned emendation?

4. 1, 13. Sicut etiam ille qui medetur vulneri corporis adhibet quaedam contraria, sicut frigidum calido vel humido siccum, vel quid aliud eius modi...
quid C DKAM^a, si quid βD^aSM edd.

The use of *quis alius*, *quid aliud* meaning 'any one else, anything else' without a preceding *si* or other subordinating conjunction is common in all periods of Latin (see Thesaurus s. v. *alius* 1630, 68-72; 1649, 49 f.). Twice I have found it in Augustine after *vel*, as here: Acad. 3, 16 (= Cic. Acad. frg. 20) Epicurus vel quis alius adversariorum negabit; and Civ. 11, 2 sicut in somnis vel quo alio tali modo... The same words are commonly found after *si* when it introduces a subordinate clause, but are less frequent when it is elliptical, or redundant, as here. A few instances are cited for Cicero's letters (1629, 36; 1630, 83), but none for Augustine.

The agreement of C with the three oldest manuscripts of the alpha group here seems to outweigh the support of the other reading, and at the same time brings the text into accord with Augustine's known usage elsewhere.

5. 1, 27. In his duobus praeceptis tota lex pendet et omnes prophetae. omnes C s.l. SM PETB, om. C DKA Q
1, 31. In eis pendere totam legem prophetasque omnes dixerat. omnes C mg. SM PQETB, om. C DKA

The first of these passages is the end of a four verse quotation from Matthew 22, 37-40, in the Old Latin version. A few pages later the same passage is referred to, this time in *oratio obliqua*. But the word *omnes* seems not to appear in the published texts of the Old Latin; neither

3. In *Doctr. Christ.* 2, 15 and 2, 16 Augustine refers to users of Latin as *Latinae linguae homines*. Cicero in *Off.* 1, 53 speaks of *societas eiusdem gentis, nationis, linguae*. My references to Latin authors follow the abbreviations of the Thesaurus, but in citing works of Augustine I give only book and section (not chapter) numbers.

is it in the Vulgate nor in the Greek original⁴. Milne, in his reconstruction (1926) of the Old Latin text of the Gospels used by Augustine, finds nine passages where Augustine quotes Matth. 22, 40. In one of these (Mor. eccl. I, 59) the printed text shows *omnes prophetae*. In none of them was a critical text available to Milne, hence the possible manuscript variants are as yet unknown.

Dom De Bruyne has shown that Augustine was a reviser of the Latin Bible⁵. He himself followed the advice that he gave to others (Doctr. 2, 21-22) to learn Greek if possible, and use that knowledge to elucidate or emend the Latin text. De Bruyne points out that Augustine made successive revisions, guided not only by his study of the Greek, but also by a desire for clarity, which at times led him to add or omit a word or two. Such an addition, I believe, is the word *omnes* here being considered.

In both passages quoted above the word is missing in the original text of C, and in the oldest manuscripts of the alpha group. It appears as a correction in C, once above the line and once in the margin, but is the normal text in the rest of the manuscripts which I have collated. As for the date of the correction in C, I have sent photos of the two pages where it appears to Professor E. A. Lowe and Professor Bernhard Bischoff. They agree in the opinion that it may be by the hand of the first scribe, or at least contemporary.

It is difficult to account for the insertion of the word by any one except Augustine himself. Neither Greek, Old Latin, nor Vulgate texts have the word, and no responsible scribe would venture to insert it without proper authority. When quoting Matthew in an earlier work (Mor. Eccl. of 389) Augustine had used *omnes*, and could well use it again. Doubtless he thought thus to improve both clarity and emphasis.

Thus it appears that Augustine was responsible for both forms of the text, the first without *omnes*, and the second with it. It would be interesting to discover other examples of 'revision by the author' in C, but I have been unable to find any. Apparently there was no general revision. But it is still possible that Augustine in reading a corrected exemplar happened on this place and, perhaps with his own hand, wrote in the word he favored to improve the text.

6. I, 25. Isto atque huius modi documentis satis ostenditur...
 isto atque huius modi (-o C) documentis (-o C²) βC SM
 istis atque huius modi documentis DKA B² bl
 isto atque huius modi documentis m

4. A. Julicher, *Itala* (1938), I, 163.

5. *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, II (1930), 521-606.

The sense of the passage is clear : " It is shown well enough by this and similar examples... " Of the readings offered, only the first states this in acceptable Latin : *documento* is easily supplied with *isto*, and *huius modi* is equivalent to *talibus*, or *aliis talibus*. The plural *istis* will not do, for only one previous example has been offered. The archetype of the alpha manuscripts DKA looked ahead for the noun required by *isto*, found only *documentis*, and wrote the plural *istis* to agree with it ; B was at some time corrected from an alpha model. The scribe of C also blundered, repeating in *modo* the ending of *isto*. A corrector with remarkable ineptitude left the *o* of *modo* unchanged, but changed *documentis* to agree with the *-o* forms preceding. The Benedictines record none of the variants, though they usually do so when they depart from the text of previous editors, as here. I take it that they were guided by the second hand of C ; at any rate that is the only support I have found for the singular *documento*. The singular will not do : Augustine is asserting that there are many examples, or proofs, to support the proposition he is discussing.

7. 2, 56. (novem) ad nullum dupla, quia intellegibiles numeri semissem non habent.

While manuscripts and editors agree on the text of this passage, it has been declared unintelligible by A. Schmitt⁶. Most translators agree in rendering *intellegibiles numeri* as ' odd numbers ', as the context seems to require⁷. But, as Schmitt points out, this translation is arbitrary ; the word for ' odd ' is not *intellegibilis*, but *impar*. Schmitt first suggests that the text may be unsound, then adds that if the text is correct, there is a possible explanation : in Macrobius (Som. I, 6, 1) it appears that the odd number was called male, the even female ; then in Augustine (Gen. c. Manich. 2, 11, 15) we are told that man was to be ruled by wisdom, and the woman by the man. Hence, Schmitt infers, ' intelligible ' numbers are those that belong to man's intellect, that is, the odd numbers. Surely Augustine did not expect his readers to make such far-fetched inferences.

Augustine elsewhere (Epist. 3, 2) makes a distinction between ' intelligible ', that is, pure, or abstract numbers and ' sensible ' numbers perceived in visible objects. The latter are infinitely divisible, but the former not so, since they are multiples of the number one, which is indivisible

6. *Aurelius Augustinus* (1930), 366.

7. So Shaw (1887), Mitterer (c. 1928), Combès (1949), Robertson (1958), but not Péronne (1873).

unity. The idea is Platonic, discussed by Aristotle, and by Plotinus⁸, and with this idea in mind the above statement is clear : for ' sensible ' numbers, nine is the double of four and a half, but for ' intelligible ' numbers it is the double of nothing, since they do not admit the notion of half.

8. 3, 18. Quisquis autem rebus praetereuntibus restrictius utitur quam sese habent mores eorum cum quibus vivit, aut intemperans aut superstitiosus est. Quisquis vero sic eis utitur ut metas consuetudinis bonorum inter quos versatur excedat, aut aliquid significat aut flagitiosus est.

intemperans *aP Eug.*, temperans *QETB*

The harder reading is *intemperans*, but it is better attested. Eugippius published his extracts from the work of Augustine early in the sixth century, and (to rely on the silence of Knoell's apparatus), all the manuscripts collated support the reading *intemperans*. Among the copies of the *De doctrina* it is supported by all of the alpha group and one of the rival family.

The reading seems hard to me because I have not found in Augustine or elsewhere a use of *intemperans* to describe a man who uses worldly things more sparingly than others. However, a man can be extravagant in his asceticism, and this is a tendency which Augustine frequently deplores. He agrees with Cicero in identifying temperance with moderation, in which there is neither too much nor too little (*Beat. vit.* 31 f.) The temperate man is marked, not by his rejection of the goods of this life, but by his ability to use them in moderation without loving them (*Mor. eccl.* 1, 39 ; *Doctr. Chr.* 1, 4). The sentences quoted, with their balanced structure, recognize the average behaviour of good men as the proper mean between parsimony and excess, and no compliment is intended for men who depart from the standard in either direction, toward extravagant or superstitious self-denial, or toward shameful excess.

William M. GREEN,
University of California Berkeley.

8. Plato, *Rep.* 7, 525DE, with Shorey's note in Loeb edition ; Arist. *Metaph.* 1, 8, 990a, 30 ; Plot. *Enn.* 5, 5, 4. For Augustine, the contemplation of pure number was an approach to divine Wisdom, and references to it in his works are common (e. g. *Mus.* 6, 12 ; *Lib. Arb.* 2, 8, 22 f.).