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There is always a tension between immensely thorough critical editions of individual medieval texts, which analyse the complex history of their textual tradition, and volumes which conveniently present a wide range of texts from a single author. Scholars may complain that Migne’s »Patrologia Latina« simply reprints existing texts from earlier centuries. At the same time, they privately benefit from the sheer convenience of so many texts of an author or attributed to that author being made available within a single volume. In the case of Hugh of Saint-Victor, whose manuscripts were so widely copied in subsequent centuries, the situation is made more complex by the existing of two distinct research groups, both dedicated to editing his writings. One group, based in Paris and involving such distinguished scholars as Patrice Sicard and Dominique Poirel, focuses on producing meticulous critical editions of individual texts, which are gradually appearing in the »Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis« (CCCM). In Frankfurt, another team, led by Rainer Berndt is committed to the goal of what he calls »Textus historici«, making available particular texts as they are preserved within individual manuscripts. This resulted in his publication in 2008 of an edition of Hugh’s »De sacramentis« from just two manuscripts, both identified as copied around 1140–1150 at Saint-Victor, one in a private collection, the other (Paris, BnF lat. 14509), assumed to be particularly authoritative (although the reasons for this were not made clear in that volume). This volume provides a pendant to the 2008 volume in seeking to reconstruct the text of the edition assumed to have been compiled at the behest of Gilduin, abbot of Saint-Victor from 1113 until his death in 1155, and drawing on just two manuscripts. One is Paris, BnF lat. 15695 from 1250, containing a wide range of Victorine texts, followed by the Dionysian »De mystica theologia« and John of Damascus. The other is Paris, BnF lat. 15009, compiled between 1160 and 1250, and containing various Victorine texts, followed by writings of other twelfth-century authors, including Geoffrey of Monmouth, Bernard Sylvestris, and Petrus Alphonsi.

The authority for identifying the contents of Gilduin’s edition initially rests on a list (the Indiculum) recorded in Oxford, Merton College MS 49, which lists 22 works, beginning with the »Chronicon«, followed by many different texts about scripture. The first part of this volume must be commended for providing our first accessible edition of the entire »Cronica« of Hugh, although without reference to the other manuscripts of this work. While this is largely a list of names and dates, it reminds us of the firmly historical foundations of Hugh’s teaching. This is followed by Berndt’s edition of Hugh’s commentary on Jerome’s introduction to the Pentateuch and of Hugh’s »Notule« on the Pentateuch and books of Kings. José Luis Navarja then supplies an edition of various pedagogical texts, introduced as items three to nine in the collected
edition of Gilduin, from the Paris, Mazarine MS 717 (produced around 1150). What is not immediately clear to the reader is that its contents are not identical to those listed in the Indiculum. One could debate whether these editions can be called critical, because they are not based on assessing differences between manuscripts. Nonetheless, Navarja supplies editions of a range of pedagogical texts of Hugh: the »Didascalicon«, followed by the »De grammatica«, the »Practica geometriae«, the »De archa Noe« (already critically edited by Sicard in CCCM 176) and »De triplici archa Noe«, and »De institutione novitiorum«.

The value of such a volume is that it provides accessible texts, although the fact that they are not included in the Brepols database, the Library of Latin Texts, means that these editions cannot be accessed in digital mode. Unsurprisingly, there is no space for extensive discussion of the many questions these texts raise. A small issue raised by Berndt's edition of the »Cronica« (or »Chronicon«) is that it includes (on p. 105) a small paragraph claiming that St Anne took three wives, taken from f. 18v of the BnF MS lat. 15009, but without making clear that this occurs on an added leaf. This is most unlikely to be an authentic text of Hugh, because this paragraph does not occur in English MSS of Hugh's »Cronica«, as is highlighted by Harrison in an excellent study, first published in the online e-British Library journal for 2002. This trinubium hypothesis, deriving from Haimo of Auxerre and accepted by Peter Lombard, was much questioned by Maurice of Kirkham in his (as yet unpublished) »Contra Salomitas«, in which Hugh's Chronicle is cited as an authority against that hypothesis. Briefly put, the inclusion of this passage within the edition reflects the way Hugh was subsequently identified with particular ideas circulating in the Parisian schools, rather than the authentic teaching of Hugh. The argument about the historicity of one specific manuscript needs to be evaluated against other manuscripts, which have just as much a claim to historical importance.

This edition is to be commended for making important Victorine texts available to the scholarly community, in particular the hitherto unpublished »Cronica« of Hugh of Saint-Victor. Nonetheless, there is a need for its text to be read with critical awareness of the complexities of the textual tradition of all these writings, so important for reshaping theological perspective and awareness of scripture in the twelfth century.