

mann ist Augustin der einzige Kirchenvater, der seine Kritik theologisch begründen kann. Die scharfe Kritik gegen die Schauspiele erklärt sich auch durch die persönlichen Erfahrungen, die er in den *Confessiones* schildert.

Alle diese Untersuchungen beleuchten vielseitig die theologische Welt Augustins. Die Schwierigkeit der Augustinus-Forschung ist immer die Begrenzung und die Auswahl bei den zahllosen Monographien und dem grossen Quellenmaterial. Die Subjektivität der Kriterien ist immer eine Realität. *Kauko Raikas*

*Hans Drexler: Ammianstudien.* Spudasmata 31. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim – New York 1974. 208 S. DM 29.80.

Ein originelles Buch, wo sich alles Mögliche von der Opferung Isaaks bis zu Erich Auerbachs *Mimesis* findet; daneben wird auch Ammian behandelt. Man hat den Eindruck, das Werk sei eine Art Tagebuch, worin der Vf. allerlei Gedanken und Assoziationen aufgezeichnet hat, die ihm bei der Ammianlektüre gekommen sind. Wirklich fruchtbare Gesichtspunkte zur Ammianforschung dürften in dem Buch schwerlich enthalten sein. *Heikki Solin*

*Monika Balzert: Die Komposition des Claudianischen Gotenkriegsgedichtes c. 26.* Spudasmata 23. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim – New York 1974. 158 S. DM 25.—.

Die sonst instruktive Einleitung verblüfft den Leser mit der kurzen unerwarteten Schlussbemerkung (S. 5) über die Wichtigkeit von Lucans erstem Buch für die vorliegende Arbeit – diese Bemerkung wird dann im Kapitel I motiviert, das also eigentlich noch zur Einleitung gehört. Eine mehr eingehende Analyse des ersten Buches Lucans (S. 22f. und passim) hätte das Schlusskapitel über die "Umkehrung der den lucanischen parallelen Geschehenszüge" (S. 85) besser vorbereitet. Die graphische Skizze auf S. 86 illustriert treffend das offenbar richtige Ergebnis der Autorin, nämlich dass "Vernachlässigung individuellen Geschehens" und "Unproportioniertheit der Schilderungen" in Claudians Gedicht auf seinem durchaus bewussten Stilisierungswillen beruhen (S. 85). Es ist nur zu bedauern, dass seitenlange Stücke im Text selbst – besonders in der detaillierten Behandlung des Gedichtes (S. 11ff.) – sowie der dem Text folgende schwerfällige Notenapparat das Lesen mühselig machen. *Saara Lilja*

**Jacobi de Viterbio O.E.S.A.: Disputatio prima de Quolibet.** Cassiciacum, Supplementband I. 1968. XXXII, 239 S. DM 59.30. – **Disputatio secunda de Quolibet.** Cassiciacum, Supplementband II. 1969. XVI, 249 S. DM 69.80. – **Disputatio tertia de Quolibet.** Cassiciacum, Supplementband III. 1973. XIV, 284 S. DM 89.50. – **Disputatio quarta de Quolibet.** Cassiciacum, Supplementband V. 1975. XII, 132 S. DM um 60.—. – [All] edendas curavit *Eelcko Ypma*. Augustinus-Verlag, Würzburg.

James of Viterbo, member of the Hermits of St. Augustine, is best known for his treatise on the Church, *De regimine christiano*, a widely used text that developed the theory of the papal plenitude of power. In addition to this text, edited by H.X.Arquillière (Le plus ancien traité de l'Église. Jacques de Viterbe: De regimine christiano, Paris 1926), only extracts from his first and second series of the quodlibetal questions have until now been published. The critical edition by Dr. Eelcko Ypma of the four series of the quodlibetal questions determined by James of Viterbo in 1293–1296 during his regency at Paris, brings us a complete text of an Augustinian theologian, whose influence in the doctrinal controversies of his time has not yet been sufficiently investigated. It is therefore to be noticed with special pleasure that the research on James of Viterbo will soon be augmented with Dr. Ypma's two other publications: an edition of James' highly interesting series of 32 questions *De Praedicamentis in Divinis*, and an article concerning his literary product at Paris during the years 1285–1300 (Recherches sur la productivité littéraire de Jacques de Viterbe à Paris (1285–1300), to be published in *Augustiniana* 25).

In comparison with the third and the fourth quodlibetal disputes of James of Viterbo, which have been transmitted only in four and three manuscripts respectively, the first and the second series have had a considerable diffusion. Of the 32 manuscripts extant of the first series, 21 have the complete text, the corresponding figures for the second series being 22 and 14. In the introduction for each volume, Dr. Ypma gives a good survey on the manuscript tradition and the earlier research, as well as an analysis of the literary sources used by James of Viterbo. The early diffusion of the first and second disputes is primarily based on the university tradition. According to the Parisian stationer's list of 1304, two series of James' quodlibetal questions were available as an exemplar consisting of 26 pieces (pecias). The manuscript selected as the basis for the edition of the first two series (Paris, Bibl.Nat.lat. 15362) represents the early university tradition, as well as the three manuscripts of Parisian origin used for the collation. As the exemplar was the final version of the disputation redacted and documented by the master and controlled by a representative of the university, it did not exactly correspond with the actual debate. Some traces of the redactional work of James of Viterbo are still to be seen in his prefaces for three series of the disputes, in which he gives a summary of the questions and explicitly states that they have been written down ". . . non in ordine quo fuerunt proposita sed secundum ordinem alicuius connexionis, a communibus et prioribus ad minus communia et posteriora procedendum est." (cited from *Quodl. I, Prol.*, 1. 6–8, p. 1). The edition thus gives us the text in its finished form, with the notes of a corrector and a reader well observed in the critical apparatus. The examination of the relationships of the manuscripts to one another, which is mainly based on the homoioteleutic omissions, would surely have benefited from a more accurate analysis of the pieces, as many of the early manuscripts bear the proper indications. Since the text had a noticeable circulation also in an abbreviated form, it would have been useful to get some information about its quality. In contrast with the first and the second series, the editor's possibilities

of using a good manuscript as the basis for the third and the fourth disputations have been rather restricted. The difficulties grow apparent especially towards the end of the third series, as the best manuscript (Bologna, Bibl. Comunale dell'Archiginnasio A 971) of the text contains only the questions I–XIV from the beginning. In some cases both of the complete manuscripts may give a false reading.

Since the quodlibetal disputes were conducted at Paris twice a year on any subject proposed by anyone present, they often dealt with current problems and revealed the determining master's reaction to the contemporary doctrines. According to the nature of the dispute, the subjects and the extent of the questions varied greatly. The questions in which James of Viterbo developed his position to the central themes of his time, concerning, *e.g.*, the real distinction of essence and existence (Quodl. I, q. IV), the nature of the agent intellect (Quodl. I, q. XII), the seminal reasons (Quodl. II, q. V; Quodl. III, q. X), and the problem of the quantity of matter (Quodl. III, q. XVII) have been given an elaborate discussion in comparison with the questions of lesser importance. What James of Viterbo thought about the relation of his own position to the theories of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, can often be traced on account of his practice to make excellent surveys of the previous doctrines before entering into his own solution. Along with the good medieval tradition the contemporary authors are always referred to anonymously. Even if the editor has deliberately left the identifying of these references for the future research, some examples from the works of Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome and Henry of Ghent have been put forth in the introduction for the first volume and in the apparatus of the fourth. With respect to the earlier authorities Dr. Ypma has done an excellent work. He has also registered some references that James of Viterbo has made to his own, now perished or still undiscovered works, such as a commentary on the *Metaphysics* (Quodl. III, q. XV, 1. 112–113, p. 199, *not* p. 119 as given in the introduction) and a question called *De animatione Coelorum* (Quodl. IV, q. XXIV, 1. 222, p. 90). As the long marginal notes that occur in many manuscripts reflect the readers' reactions from the turn of the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, the editor's practice of giving their exact *locus* is to be recommended. Each volume has been provided with accurate indexes. The misprints are rather few and as such to be noted (Quodl. II, q. X, 1. 97, p. 125; Quodl. IV, q. I, 1. 91, p. 4; Quodl. IV, q. XV, 1. 55, p. 93; Quodl. IV, Index totalis nominum et rerum, 1. 5, p. 122). *Anja Inkeri Lehtinen*

*L.D.Reynolds* and *N.G.Wilson*: **Scribes and Scholars**. A guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin literature. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Clarendon Press Oxford 1974. X, 275 p., XVI plates. £ 6.00.

It was a good idea to give a second edition of this excellent book, as some of the "serious backwards" of the first edition, to use the wording of a reviewer, could be removed. The addition of important footnotes to the revised edition is one of the most notable improvements. The new chapter on the scholarship of the post-Renaissance period up to the modern times is welcomed, too. *Heikki Solin*