



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Manuscripts of the Latin classics 800-1200

Kwakkel, Erik

Citation

Kwakkel, E. (Ed.). (2015). *Manuscripts of the Latin classics 800-1200*. Leiden University Press (LUP). Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/41211>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/41211>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Studies in Medieval and
Renaissance Book Culture
**Manuscripts of the Latin
Classics 800-1200**

Edited by Erik Kwakkel

Leiden University Press



Manuscripts of the Latin Classics 800-1200

Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Book Culture

This series presents studies related to medieval manuscripts and early printed books. The scope is broad and includes the production and use of these books, their readers, and their physical appearance. An emphasis of the series is to discuss material features of the objects and to do so in relationship to the cultural-intellectual context of the period.

General Editor

Erik Kwakkel, Leiden University

Editorial Board

Rolf H. Bremmer Jr., Leiden University

Alexandra Gillespie, University of Toronto

Rosamond McKitterick, University of Cambridge

William Noel, University of Pennsylvania

Nigel F. Palmer, University of Oxford

Studies in Medieval and
Renaissance Book Culture

**Manuscripts of the
Latin Classics 800-1200**

Edited by Erik Kwakkel

Leiden University Press

Cover illustration: Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 82, fol. 1v (detail)

Cover design and layout: Mulder van Meurs, Amsterdam

ISBN 978 90 8728 226 4

e-ISBN 978 94 0060 210 6 (pdf)

e-ISBN 978 94 0060 211 3 (epub)

NUR: 613/615

© E. Kwakkel / Leiden University Press 2015

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

This book is distributed in North America by the University of Chicago Press (www.press.uchicago.edu).

Contents

- 7 List of Figures and Plates
- 9 Preface
- 11 Abbreviations

- 13 **Manuscripts of the Latin Classics 800-1200:**
An Introduction
Erik Kwakkel

- 23 **Carolingian Scholarship on Classical Authors:**
Practices of Reading and Writing
Mariken Teeuwen

- 53 **The Transmission of Tibullus in the Tenth and
Eleventh Centuries**
Robert G. Babcock

- 77 **Diagrams of Knowledge and Rhetoric in
Manuscripts of Cicero's *De inventione***
Irene O'Daly

- 107 **Classics on Scraps: Classical Manuscripts Made from
Parchment Waste**
Erik Kwakkel

- 131 **Living with Ovid: The Founding of Arnulf of
Orléans' Thebes**
David T. Gura

169	William of Malmesbury and the Classics: New Evidence Rodney Thomson
187	Notes on Contributors
193	Colour Plates
217	Index of Manuscripts
219	General Index

Figures and Plates

Figures

- 12 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 82, fol. 1v (detail)
- 22 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLF 48, fol. 2r (detail)
- 44 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8658A, fol. 11r
- 52 Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 5380-84, fol. 44v (detail)
- 76 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 28, fol. 2v (detail)
- 81 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLQ 33, fol. 56r (scheme)
- 84 Montpellier, Bibliothèque Inter-Universitaire, Section Médecine, H 335, fol. 26r (scheme)
- 85 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, III.E.30, fol. 193r (scheme)
- 94 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 28, fol. 2v (scheme)
- 106 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92, fol. 133r (detail)
- 130 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4°, fol. 46v (detail)
- 137 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 7205, fol. 29v (detail)
- 168 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Arch. Seld.B.16, fol. 73r (detail)

Colour plates

- 193 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLF 30, fol. 1or (detail)
- 194 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLQ 18, fol. 4r (detail)
- 195 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLF 48, fol. 2r
- 196 Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 5380-84, fols. 44v-45r
- 198 St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 817, p. 343
- 199 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLQ 33, fol. 56r (detail)

- 200 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 127 AC, fol. 99r
(detail)
- 201 Montpellier, Bibliothèque Inter-Universitaire, Section
Médecine, H 335, fol. 26r
- 202 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLF 70, fol. 51r (detail)
- 203 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 28, fol. 2v
- 204 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 1925, fol. 111r (detail)
- 205 Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 3067-73, fol. 74r
- 206 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92, fol. 133r
- 207 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92, fol. 127r (detail)
- 208 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92, fol. 128r (detail)
- 209 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92, fol. 138v (detail)
- 210 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLO 92, fol. 124r
- 211 Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 191 D (inserted slip)
- 212 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 7205, fol. 29v
- 213 Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 7205, fol. 38r
- 214 Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Q 91,
fol. 94v (detail)
- 215 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, cod. Guelf.
13.10 Aug. 4°, fol. 46v

Preface

The essays in this volume are devoted to the production and use of the Latin classics between 800 and 1200. As with the previous books in this series, the manuscript, both as an object on the desk of the scribe and in the hands of the reader or editor, informs the overarching perspective from which the studies engage with their material. The essays by Irene O'Daly, Mariken Teeuwen, and Rodney Thomson are expanded and revised papers read during the colloquium 'Writing the Classics', organised by my research project 'Turning Over a New Leaf: Manuscript Innovation in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance' on 3 September 2013 in collaboration with Leiden University Library. The essays of David Gura and Robert Babcock were written specially for this volume, and I wish to thank both authors for their generous contribution. My own essay, which springs from a discovery made in Leiden University Library in the fall of 2012, was also specially written for this volume. I wish to thank Leiden University Press for their continued help and encouragement in expanding the 'Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Book Culture' series and Jenny Weston for copy-editing the essays in this third volume.

EK–8 December, 2014

Abbreviations

BAV	Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
Bodleian	Oxford, Bodleian Library
BIU	Bibliothèque Inter-Universitaire, Section Médecine
BL	London, British Library
BM	Bibliothèque municipale
BnF	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France
BPL	Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Bibliotheca Publica Latina
BSB	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
CUL	Cambridge, University Library
PL	<i>Patrologia cursus completus, series latina</i> , ed. J.P. Migne (Paris: Migne etc., 1884-65)
SB	Stiftsbibliothek
UB	Universiteitsbibliotheek
VLF	Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus Folio
VLO	Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus Octavo
VLQ	Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus Quarto

antare credi p p q a l c u m



Manuscripts of the Latin Classics 800-1200:

An Introduction

Erik Kwakkel

In his essay on the production and use of classical manuscripts in the eleventh and twelfth centuries Birger Munk Olsen raises a point that may well be taken as a reason *not* to produce a volume like the one you are holding: medieval copies of classical works do not naturally constitute a distinct category.¹ As Munk Olsen notes, there is nothing that makes them stand out as a group, at least not physically or as far as the circumstances of their production are concerned. Up to a certain point the essays presented here confirm this given. While they show that it is worthwhile to examine specific codicological or palaeographical phenomena, as shown by Mariken Teeuwen's analysis of marginal glossing in classical books from the Carolingian age and Irene O'Daly's examination of diagrams in eleventh-century copies of Cicero's rhetorical works, such physical manifestations are by no means exclusive to the classical tradition (nor do the authors claim they are). Indeed, at several points in this book, parallels will be highlighted between manuscripts of the classics and those of non-classical contents, for example with respect to the use of scrap material as writing support, as outlined in my chapter, and again in Mariken Teeuwen's discussion of the marginal apparatus in Carolingian manuscripts. In other words, this book also

1. Munk Olsen, 'The Production of the Classics', 5.

suggests that medieval scribes did not necessarily treat a copy differently just because it contained a classical text.

Still, there are reasons why it is fruitful to study classical manuscripts as a discrete group – and unite essays of this nature in a single volume. While the production method of such books may not be distinctive, the existence of certain codicological and palaeographical trends suggests that scribes did favour peculiarities – mannerisms, perhaps – when it came to copying and engaging with the classics. One of these instances is discussed in my own chapter, which inspects a type of classical manuscript that may be placed at the very lowest end of the spectrum as far as its quality of production is concerned. The essay introduces seven manuscripts made from scrap parchment: redundant material from the edge of the skin that lay on the scribe's desk when he had finished producing the regular sheets. While such offcuts were also used for the production of manuscripts containing other texts, in particular vernacular works, the classical 'scrap book' may be seen as an expression of a broader trend among classical manuscripts, at least those from the tenth to the twelfth centuries: a remarkably high number of these are of lower quality in terms of their script, writing support, and decoration. In other words, scribes resorted to the lower end of the quality spectrum when they executed the different production stages of a classical manuscript – more so, it appears, than they did when they copied other texts.

Another peculiarity that seems more popular in the classical manuscript tradition lies beyond the scope of this essay collection. It concerns the high frequency with which classical texts were copied in so-called 'holsterbooks': tall manuscripts with narrow pages that broke with the medieval rules of page design. It has been argued that holsterbooks, which

are commonly very thin and light due to the limited number of quires they contain, were ideally suited for handheld use.² This would explain, for example, why nearly all surviving Tropers and Cantatoria produced before 1200 are in holster format, since these liturgical books were held during use by the soloist, rather than being placed on a lectern.³ However, a study based on a random sample of eighty holsterbooks shows that almost half of them (thirty-five copies) contain classical works, with Horace, Statius, and Ovid topping the list. No other genre in the corpus of eighty is represented by such a high number. Indeed, the runner-up, books made for liturgical use, totals only thirteen specimens.⁴

Both the high frequency of lower grade manuscripts and the popularity of the holster format tie classical manuscripts together as a group: during their production scribes apparently *did* treat them differently, albeit not each time they copied one, nor necessarily in every physical respect. Another reason why it makes sense to study classical manuscripts as a group is their shared, almost single-focused manner of use. In the period covered by these essays, 800-1200, the Latin classics were particularly popular in the schools, as is well known.⁵ Teachers such as Gerbert of Aurillac (d. 1003), Conrad of Hirschau (d. 1150?), and Alexander Nequam (d. 1217) all stress the importance of the classics in the curriculum, a given that is confirmed by surviving booklists from monastic and cathedral schools.⁶ Popular textbooks used in the eleventh and twelfth centuries included Priscian for grammar; Cicero's *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* for rhetoric; and for dialectics Porphyry's *Isagoge*, Aristotle's *Categories* and *De interpretatione* (through commentaries of Boethius), Cicero's *Topica* and Boethius' *De topicis differentiis*.⁷ While the presence of classical authors was perhaps less pronounced in the

2. Kwakkel, 'Dit boek heeft niet de vereiste breedte', 39-40 (handheld use) and 44 (limited number of quires).

3. Cantatoria: Huglo, 'The Cantatorium', 96, Table 3.1a and 99, Table 3.2; and Gamber, *Codices Liturgici Latini Antiquiores*, 2: 500-503. Tropers: Huglo, 'The Cantatorium', 97, Table 3.1b.

4. Kwakkel, 'Dit boek heeft niet de vereiste breedte', Appendix.

5. See, for example, Scaglione, 'The Classics in Medieval Education'; Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 113-6; Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 19-26; and Reynolds, "Let him read the Satires of Horace".

6. Nequam: Haskins, 'A List of Text-Books from the Close of the Twelfth Century' and Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, 7-8; Conrad: Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism*, 39-64 (esp. 40, 49, 51, and 54); Gerbert: Bowen, *A History of Western Education*, 45; Booklists: Glauche, *Schullektüre im Mittelalter*, 62-100.

7. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 21-4.

8. Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, 5 n. 10.

9. Munk Olsen, 'The Production of Classics', 2 and the Appendix at 17. Note how the author implies that the majority of surviving codices 'were destined for the schools' (2).

10. For examples, see Munk Olsen, *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles. Tome IV*, 369-94; Kwakkel, 'Dit boek heeft niet de vereiste breedte', 41; and the three main manuscripts used in Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*.

11. This is the main argument of my 'Dit boek heeft niet de vereiste breedte'; a more in depth study will appear in the monograph I am currently preparing with Francis Newton on The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 73 J 6 (Constantine the African, *Pantegni*).

curriculum of the universities, they maintained a strong presence there after 1200. This is shown, for example, by the 1431 statutes of Oxford University, which stipulate that Priscian must be used for teaching grammar, and Boethius (*Topica*) and Aristotle for logic, while rhetoric was to be taught with Aristotle (*Rhetoric*), Boethius (*Topica*), Cicero (*Nova rhetorica*), Ovid (*Metamorphoses*), and Virgil (*Poetria*).⁸

The dominant presence of the classics in the medieval curriculum is important to our understanding of classical manuscripts as physical objects. The majority of surviving copies, after all, will likely have been made for a single setting: education. As Munk Olsen points out, the most widely diffused works in his inventory of 2500 classical manuscripts written between 1000 and 1200 are textbooks, including teaching manuals like Cicero's *De inventione*.⁹ This implies, of course, that a great deal of surviving copies, perhaps even the majority, were used by instructors, who may have copied many with their own hands. After all, if we agree that education is perhaps the driving force behind their production, then we also ought to agree on the specific pragmatics of their use, namely that they were made for teachers. Indeed, from a fair number of manuscripts it has already been determined that they were used by actual teachers.¹⁰ The potentially very high number of teaching copies among the surviving manuscripts should be taken into account when we study the physical features of classical books or try to explain the trends we observe. Thus we may well relate the high number of holsterbooks with classical contents to classroom instruction: such books allowed the teacher to walk around with his teaching text held open in his hand.¹¹ In sum, the shared manner of use provides yet another justification and encouragement for studying classical manuscripts as a class apart.

It is within these two key areas of production and use that the essays collected in this volume operate. Production features perhaps most prominently in my contribution on the use of scrap material, as already discussed, but it is also part of David Gura's essay on manuscripts of Arnulf of Orléans' commentary to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The commentary was composed during the late twelfth century in the cathedral school of St Euverte, where Arnulf taught. Gura shows how the layout of the manuscripts invites us to divide the transmission into two branches: codices with a so-called *catena* format, where the commentary is turned into the primary work of the manuscript, and those that present Arnulf's commentary as *scholia* in the margins and between the lines. The *catena* manuscripts, which represent the oldest stage in the transmission, are clearly tied to education. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are reduced to short lemmata, which are often underscored and placed at the outset of commentary segments, while the commentary forms the bulk of the page's main textblock. This presentation, Gura argues, made the manuscripts particularly suitable for oral lectures. The *scholion* format, by contrast, was not so much designed as a teaching tool, but intended to facilitate clarity and understanding of Ovid's text to an individual who was educated but not necessarily an educator.

Like Gura, Robert Babcock discusses the reception of an ancient author in a specific milieu. This time it concerns Tibullus in the diocese of Liège during the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. Within the broader framework of the diffusion of Tibullus manuscripts in the Middle Ages, the number of which is remarkably modest, Babcock demonstrates the importance of the schools of Liège in the transmission of Tibullus and he gauges how readers there engaged with his work. After providing a first reconstruction of the

relationship between the surviving and lost manuscripts, the chapter focuses on Egbert of Liège, teacher and author of a schoolbook titled *The Well-Laden Ship*. He is brought to the stage to show how an individual from the context of the schools treated Tibullus' work and how deeply the ancient author was understood there. In his instructional text Egbert borrows from Tibullus, but at the same time he modifies his source, much like Arnulf of Orléans did with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Egbert extracts what he sees as useful and employs Tibullus' pagan text for a Christian message.

Rodney Thomson's chapter on William of Malmesbury (d. 1143) as a reader and interpreter of ancient Latin classical texts brings into view a third region: England. Thomson's previous work on William of Malmesbury is well known and in this essay he presents finds that shed new light on the author's dealings with the classics. In the first, the emphasis is on how ancient texts were used by the medieval author. Thomson shows, for example, how William of Malmesbury was familiar with Latin texts that were relatively unknown in the period, such as Apuleius' *De deo Socratis* (second century) and Ausonius' *Ephemeris* (fourth century). The manner in which he weaves the classical passages into his works shows that William of Malmesbury knew his source texts very well. Unusually, he uses them in a biblical commentary and a set of *miracula*. The second part of Thomson's essay is devoted to a set of short texts about the lives and works of three late-antique authors, Apollinaris (d. 489), Symmachus (d. 402), and Mythographus, who lived around 500. This part briefly outlines why these introductions may be attributed to William of Malmesbury, using new manuscript evidence. The third and largest section of this chapter adds to our understanding of Malmesbury as an editor of ancient texts. The manner in

which William of Malmesbury emends a text, Thomson argues, is an achievement in that it is comparable to how editors in the sixteenth century would proceed.

The final two essays, by Mariken Teeuwen and Irene O'Daly, also deal with readers' interactions with the Latin classics. Both take visual manifestations on the page as a starting point. Teeuwen's essay discusses the reception of the classics among readers in the Carolingian age by focusing on an ancient system of mark-up symbols found in classical manuscripts of the ninth century. The symbols turn out to be just as meaningful as the glosses they accompany. Resorting to ancient signs that were smaller than the nib that wrote them, readers expressed such sentiments as disagreement (prompted by the obelus) or approval (asterisk). At the end of her essay Teeuwen presents an important qualification: annotations of the kind she studies are often placed in a context of education. While some annotated books may have been used in schools, we ought to see these objects also, principally perhaps, as expressions of scholarship and scholarly debates. Marginal glosses, as well as the clever system with which they are dressed up, are tools that facilitate research of this kind.

Focusing on diagrams, Irene O'Daly presents a study of visual representations of knowledge and rhetoric within the manuscript tradition of Cicero's *De inventione*, an authoritative textbook in the medieval curriculum. The fact that these diagrams circulated in tandem with the *De inventione* in a number of cases, demonstrates that medieval readers were interested in placing the study of rhetoric in a broader intellectual context. O'Daly considers the purpose of two sets of diagrams from Leiden collections, which present a summary of the parts of rhetoric. O'Daly suggests that by summarising aspects of Cicero's text they served as a form of visual introduction to its

12. For the quote and the historiographical context in which it is to be understood, see Benson and Constable, 'Introduction', xxiv.

content. Furthermore, by identifying possible sources for their labels (Alcuin, Boethius) she demonstrates the rich textual environment within which such visual features must be situated.

Charles Homer Haskins may have overstated things somewhat when he wrote: 'From the fall of the Roman Empire down well into modern times the Latin Classics furnished the best barometer of the culture of each period in Western Europe'.¹² Still, the Latin classics are a useful instrument to inspect certain aspects of medieval culture, as is hoped that these six essays will show. The collection ultimately demonstrates the variety of ways in which medieval individuals engage with classical material: yearning for a deeper understanding of ancient texts, they exhibit an array of strategies to produce, transmit, and apply ancient knowledge.

Bibliography

- Benson, R.L., and G. Constable, 'Introduction', in R.L. Benson and G. Constable, eds., *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1991)
- Bowen, J., *A History of Western Education, Volume Two: Civilization of Europe, Sixth to Sixteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1975)
- Evans, G.R., *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)
- Gamber, K., *Codices liturgici Latini antiquiores*, Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 1, 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1968)
- Glauche, G., *Schullektüre im Mittelalter: Entstehung und Wandlungen des Lektürekanons bis 1200 nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Munich: Arbo-Gesellschaft, 1970)
- Haskins, C.H., 'A List of Text-Books from the Close of the Twelfth Century', in C.H. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1924), Chapter 8

- Hexter, R.J., *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto and Epistulae Heroidum* (Munich: Ardeo-Gesellschaft, 1986)
- Huglo, M., 'The Cantatorium: From Charlemagne to the Fourteenth Century', in P. Jeffery, ed., *The Study of Medieval Chant: Paths and Bridges, East and West: In Honor of Kenneth Levy* (Rochester: The Boydell Press, 2001)
- Leclercq, J., *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, 3rd edn. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2003)
- Kwakkel, E., 'Dit boek heeft niet de vereiste breedte: Afwijkende bladdimensies in de elfde en twaalfde eeuw', *Jaarboek Nederlandse Boekgeschiedenis* 19 (2012): 33-49
- Minnis, A.J., and A.B. Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100-c.1375: The Commentary Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)
- Munk Olsen, B., 'The Production of the Classics in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in C.A. Chavannes-Mazel and M.M. Smith, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use* (Los Altos Hills: Anderson-Lovelace, 1996), 1-18
- , *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles. Tome IV, 2^e Partie: La réception de la littérature classique manuscrite et texts* (Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 2014)
- Reynolds, S., "'Let him read the Satires of Horace': Reading, Literacy and Grammar in the Twelfth Century", in J. Raven et al., eds., *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 22-40
- , *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Scaglione, A., 'The Classics in Medieval Education', in A.S. Bernardo and S. Levin, eds., *The Classics in the Middle Ages* (Binghamton, NY: CMERS, 1990), 343-62

[Faint handwritten notes in the left margin:]

[Faint handwritten notes in the right margin:]

[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom left:]

[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom right:]

Carolingian Scholarship on Classical Authors: Practices of Reading and Writing

Mariken Teeuwen

When the term Carolingian Renaissance was minted in the 1830s by the French literary historian Ampère, the achievement of preserving and appropriating the classics was one of the reasons to use this very term – Renaissance.¹ In the reigns of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and Charles the Bald, so it was argued, a real effort was made to collect ancient (and late-ancient) literary heritage, and the study of this heritage deeply influenced the literary culture of the late eighth and ninth centuries. With the term ‘renaissance’ other factors were acknowledged as well: a general revival of letters, culture, and art; a concern with Latin as the language of religion, administration, and court; and a great concern for a unified Christian church, with one dogma, one cult, one identity.² Nevertheless, the revival of the study of the classics, and the reverence for the Latin of the classical authors was recognized as an important characteristic.

The Carolingian achievement was indeed remarkable in this respect. A great number of manuscripts from the Carolingian period survive with ancient or late-ancient texts. The texts of only a few ancient authors (Virgil, Terence, Livy)

1. Sullivan, ‘Introduction’, 5, notes 11–12.

2. Contreni, ‘The Carolingian Renaissance’, esp. 709–12.

3. Bischoff, 'Libraries and Schools in the Carolingian Revival of Learning'; Bischoff, 'Benedictine Monasteries and the Survival of Classical Literature'.

4. See, for example, Ziolkowski and Putnam, eds., *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years*.

survive in complete manuscripts from antiquity; for all other authors the oldest surviving manuscripts are from the Carolingian period, or even later. In all the major Carolingian intellectual centres – that is, the monasteries with libraries that started growing in the eighth century, and were in their full glory in the ninth century – classical authors feature in their catalogues, and new copies were produced in their scriptoria. Classical texts were part of the intellectual backbone of the average ninth-century scholar, who recognized quotes from Virgil, Terence, and Horace just as he would recognize quotes from the Bible.³

An important source for the history of the study of the classics through time is the transmission history of texts and authors, as explored by Reynolds and Wilson in their fundamental *Scribes and Scholars*, in Reynolds' edited volume, *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, or in Munk Olsen's multi-volumed *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, and has been researched for many individual authors and texts.⁴ In this essay, however, a different approach is taken: whereas previous scholarship has investigated *which* authors and texts were read and copied, and *when* and *where* this happened, my focus will be on *how* they were read and copied. It is my goal to analyze the methods of readership and scholarship that we encounter in Carolingian manuscripts of the classics as reflected by the manuscripts themselves. My eye will therefore drift from the main text to the margin, where the traces left by copyists, readers, and students are found. Three different types of scholarship witnessed by these marginal voices will be introduced and analyzed here. First the signs of textual criticism, an activity which had the correction of the ancient and late-ancient texts as its main goal, will be studied. A second type of activi-

ty that we can witness in the margin is the establishment and evolution of commentary traditions, which reflect a use in the classroom or a smaller-scale educational setting, such as a private exchange between a master and one or two students. The third type of marginal activity I will briefly reflect upon is a less-organised one, and testifies to individual readers' interests in texts.

No claim is made that these three types are the only ones which characterize the Carolingian appropriation of classical texts. On the contrary, I am convinced that more types will surface as the study of the annotation practices in Carolingian manuscripts continues, and as we create better inventories for their shared and individual traits in the process. The current paper should be seen as a first exploration of material that has been little studied until now. Up until five or ten years ago, medieval manuscripts were only studied by palaeographers, codicologists, and philologists, either in the pursuit of data on the material culture of the book, or in the pursuit of making editions. Nowadays, with the fast growing number of digital facsimiles on the web, the medieval book has an unprecedented presence in the work of a more diverse range of scholars, and is starting to become a much richer source for the intellectual history of the Middle Ages. Textual practices that were hidden in, or even completely erased by the critical apparatus of traditional editions, can now be consulted with ease by any scholar who has access to the internet. The present paper, which explores the marginal and interlinear annotations in the margins of early medieval manuscripts of the classics, is an example of such new research possibilities. It explores textual practices in these manuscripts which have generally been ignored or at times deliberately obliterated by earlier scholarship, and this

5. Mostert, 'The Tradition of Classical Texts in the Manuscripts of Fleury', 23-8; Munk Olsen, 'The Production of Classics', 5.

6. See, for example, Charlier, 'Les manuscrits personnels de Florus de Lyon et son activité littéraire'; Pellegriin, 'Les manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières'.

exploration is based on the assessment of digital facsimiles or the consultation of manuscripts 'in the flesh', namely from Leiden University's collections.

Before I start my exploration, however, a second *caveat* is appropriate: no claim is made here that the textual practices witnessed in the margin and interlinear space of manuscripts with classical texts are peculiar to either the genre or the period. As for the genre: classical texts and Christian texts, such as treatises from the Church Fathers, are surrounded with the same kind of annotations; and their lay-outs, sizes, and variations in the quality of their parchment and scribal work are identical. In fact, one could question whether a category of classical texts would be useful in its own right. Such a category could be seen, after all, as an anachronism, as was done by Marco Mostert in his article on the classical texts in the manuscripts of Fleury.⁵ That said, it is still worth considering which textual practices were used in Carolingian manuscripts of the classics. As for the period: at present our knowledge of standard and peculiar textual practices specific to the margin is too limited. Individual case studies have been done,⁶ but a systematic assessment of the practice of annotating books in the Middle Ages is still lacking. It is one of the goals of my current research to start filling this lacuna for the Carolingian period.

Textual Criticism: Lucretius and Macrobius

The first type of marginal scholarship encountered in Carolingian copies of classical texts introduced here is textual criticism. This may be an unexpected category, since textual criticism is supposed to be a nineteenth-century scholarly method, connected to the birth of the critical edition, to Karl Lachmann and his stemmatological approach, or perhaps to the

eighteenth-century methods developed by Johann Albrecht Bengel and Johann Jakob Griesbach to make new editions of the New Testament. Nevertheless, as the provocative book by Mireille Chazan and Gilbert Dahan, *La méthode critique au Moyen Âge*, convincingly shows, medieval scholars had their own methods of checking their copies against others, and of recording variant readings, emendations, and lacunae.⁷

One of the most famous manuscripts from Leiden proves this point: the ninth-century VLF 30, which is one of the two copies of Lucretius' *De rerum naturae* kept in Leiden (the other one is VLF 94, also from the ninth century). They are the only two complete surviving copies of the text. There is another fragment, also from the ninth century, in addition to a handful of references in library catalogues to the author or his work, as well as some excerpts of the text in florilegia. The text disappeared after the ninth century until its rediscovery in the early fifteenth century, apparently by the Italian humanist Poggio Bracciolini, who set out to find ancient treasures in monastic libraries.⁸ The two complete manuscripts, VLF 94 and VLF 30, have been nicknamed the *Lucretius Oblongus* and the *Lucretius Quadratus* after their shape: the *Oblongus* is a rather long and narrow book with measurements of approximately 314x204 mm (height x width), the *Quadratus* is smaller, and almost quadrangular with measurements of approximately 227x215 mm. They have been studied in great detail by David Ganz; his findings are summarized here.⁹ The *Oblongus* is dated to the beginning of the ninth century and was written by a scribe trained in Northwest Germany, perhaps in Mainz. The book was written with exceptional care, in a large and beautifully-shaped Carolingian minuscule. Red ink and uncial letters are used to structure the text for the reader. To quote Ganz:

7. Chazan and Dahan, 'Préface', 7-11.

8. Bischoff, 'Libraries and Schools', 110.

9. Ganz, 'Lucretius in the Carolingian Age', 91-102.

10. Ganz, 'Lucretius in the Carolingian Age', 92.

11. Bischoff, *Karl der Grosse, Werk und Wirkung*, 206, no. 365.

12. Ganz, 'Lucretius in the Carolingian Age', 94-5; Ferrari, "In papia convenient ad Dungalum"; Vezin, 'Observations sur l'origine des manuscrits légués par Dungal a Bobbio'.

'it is hard to think of a contemporary non liturgical volume copied in such large script and with such lavish spacing'.¹⁰

A second scribe can be observed to work on the text: he noted variant readings and filled in lacunae. He worked in the margin but seems to have taken care not to spoil the beauty of the page. He inserts corrections with a triple-dot omission symbol, which mark lines with errors in the metre of Lucretius' verses (e.g. on fols. 94r, 166v, and 176v). Sometimes he 'overrules' the text in a more invasive way, by erasing words or lines, or overwriting them in his own hand. In this process of close collaboration between copyist and corrector it should be noted that the copyist was clearly aware of the fact that the corrector would check his work, for he sometimes left blank spaces for the corrector to work in. On fol. 10r their cooperation is clearly visible: the corrector takes over from the scribe and adds some lines to the text (Plate 1).

A close study of this second hand has made it possible to establish the identity of the corrector: Bischoff unmasked him as Dungal, an Irish scholar who was active at the court of Charlemagne around 800.¹¹ Dungal was famous for his knowledge of the classics. In 811 he composed a treatise on lunar eclipses, in which he cites from Macrobius' commentary on Cicero's *Dream of Scipio*; and in one of his letters he compares the crossing of the Channel with a crossing between Scylla and Charybdis. In 825, he was appointed schoolmaster in Pavia, and he was an active monk in Bobbio, where he donated a number of manuscripts to the library upon his death.¹² While it may be a surprise that a work with such overtly non-Christian content was read at all in a monastic environment in the ninth century, the fact that it was Dungal who actively studied the text in order to create a reliable witness for this text, is perhaps less surprising.

A generation later a scholar lived of whom we know a great deal more: Lupus of Ferrières (c. 805 – c. 862). He was one of the most famous scholars of his time who left a collection of letters in which he writes about the process of seeking out more copies of a text in order to compare and correct.¹³ From a young age, Lupus was a monk in Ferrières, where he must have excelled in school from early on, for his abbot sent him to Fulda to study under Rhabanus Maurus. Lupus brought some books with him to Fulda, including Cicero's *De inventione* and Boethius' *Consolatio philosophiae*, which he knew to be flawed and incomplete copies. In Fulda, he was hoping to correct his copies, and what he could not find there, he tried to find elsewhere: he began to write letters to sister abbeys, to bishops and even the pope in order to get his hands on new texts, or texts for which he had a less than perfect copy. Fortunately a collection of his letters has survived in one manuscript, which is now in Paris (BnF, lat. 2858).¹⁴ These letters inform us of his quest for books and his hunt for texts. Another testimony to his insatiable pursuit of books and knowledge is the rich library and flourishing scriptorium in Ferrières, where Lupus was appointed abbot in 840 by Charles the Bald. Next to the letters and the library, however, the manuscripts themselves – and especially their margins – bear clear evidence of Lupus' work: an entire group of manuscripts has been recognized to contain annotations and emendations in his own hand.¹⁵

In the way Lupus annotated his manuscripts, he shows himself principally as a collator and not a teacher. He did not use the margin to offer explanations or additional information to the readers, instead, he carefully corrected texts and suggested alternative readings, but he did so with the use of a limited, unobtrusive set of signs. An example of his working

13. Bischoff, 'Palaeography and the Transmission of Classical Texts', 123-6; Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*; Holtz, 'L'humanisme de Loup de Ferrières'.

14. The digital facsimile is available at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/112148/btv1b10318625w>, accessed May 2014.

15. Bischoff, 'Palaeography and the Transmission of Classical Texts', 123-7; Pellegrin, 'Les manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières'. A new study of Lupus and his manuscripts is on the way in Allen's fresh edition and commentary of Lupus' letters for CCCM. I thank Michael Allen for sharing with me an article pre-publication: 'Poems by Lupus, written by Heiric'.

method is found in a manuscript from Tours, BnF, lat. 6370, with Macrobius' *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*.¹⁶ In this manuscript four different hands copied the text. In addition, in the margin up to six different hands may be identified, ranging from the ninth to the fifteenth century. Lupus' hand is among these marginal scribes: he marked words or passages for which he had an alternative reading, using a symbol consisting of three dots (tridot), and the Tironian sign for *alter* (a vertical stroke with a second stroke attached that resembles the number 2, such as in BnF, lat. 6370, fol. 20r). A second characteristic is his use of the Tironian sign for *antiquus*, a triangle or Greek capital delta (Δ), which he also used to mark a variant reading (fol. 39v). The fourth way to mark variants used by Lupus is more universal: an abbreviated *vel* ('or') followed by an alternative reading. Characteristic for Lupus' hand is his use of a particular nota-sign (meaning: *nota (bene)*, 'pay attention here'). The use of the nota-sign is very common in Carolingian manuscripts, but Lupus' nota has a distinctive and recognizable shape: it combines N and T in a rather abstract way, so that the sign resembles two steps of a staircase rather than the letter combination (e.g. fol. 19v). Slashes with dots (/ or ·/) are also used, usually to mark a place where an insertion should be made.

This limited and rather neutral set of signs has been found in many manuscripts, which have been subsequently assigned to Lupus or his close circle, both on account of the presence of the signs in the margin and on the basis of the evidence from Lupus' letters, in which he talks about his pursuit of certain texts. VLF 12b and VLF 122, two fragments containing Cicero's *De senectute* and Macrobius' *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio* respectively, both dating to the second third of the ninth century, have been suggested to contain corrections

in Lupus' own hand. This verdict is based on the presence, among other things, of the dotted slash to mark the place of insertions, or his typical nota-sign.

While we may find a few of Lupus' characteristics in these manuscripts, the evidence is very slim and inconclusive: the use of a dotted slash is not exclusive to Lupus; it is, in fact, quite a common practice for marking a place where an insertion should be made, just as the abbreviated '*vel*' for variants in the margin. The attribution to Lupus has therefore been contested and is no longer commonly accepted in the Leiden cases. But an important observation we *can* make is that his system of annotation and his way of marking-up texts during the process of collation spread beyond his personal use: it was also used by a circle of 'disciples' around him. We may understand him, therefore, as part of a school of textual scholarship, or perhaps even call him the inventor of a particular set of textual practices to mark textual variants. He was, at any rate, one of the first scholars to reflect on this kind of scholarly activity, which is also found in kindred institutions, such as the monasteries of St Benedict in Fleury and St Germain at Auxerre.¹⁷

17. Bischoff, 'Benedictine Monasteries and the Survival of Classical Literature', 145; Von Büren, 'Auxerre, lieu de production de manuscrits?', 171-4.

Signs with Ancient Roots

As shown by these examples from Lupus and his circle, sets of signs were used to mark variants or insert lacunae. Some of these signs had roots in antiquity, where they were first developed in the context of textual scholarship on Homer at the great library of Alexandria in the third century BCE. Aristarchus of Samothrace is famed with the development of such a set of symbols, to be applied to the multiple copies of Homer collected in the library. With the signs, passages could be marked for which the Alexandrian scholars had

18. McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri*.

19. McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri*; Jocelyn, 'The Annotations of M. Valerius Probus'.

found variants, or which were clearly corrupt. The symbols used included, among others, the asteriskus (star), obelus (a horizontal stroke with or without dots), diple (a symbol resembling a fishhook (>) or arrow head), chrisimon (a chi-rho combined into one sign), ancora (a circle or half circle).¹⁸ In the Middle Ages, lists of these symbols for text criticism were still transmitted, either independently or as a part of the (encyclopaedic) works of Isidore or Cassiodorus. Key texts in this transmission are *Anecdota Parisinum* and *Liber Glossarum*, which include lists of these signs with explanations, but also descriptions handed down by Isidore in his *Etymologiae* and by Cassiodorus in his *Expositio in Psalmos* and *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum*.

The precise transmission history of these texts dealing with the critical signs and their relationships to each other is immensely complicated, with so many variants, rewritings, summaries, and extended versions that it has confused many editors.¹⁹ Classicists, driven by their interest in recovering the ancient scholarly textual practices in the corrupted and incomplete medieval sources, have struggled with the definition of historical layers in the transmission of these lists and texts. What should be considered part of the classical tradition of textual scholarship? And what should be considered a medieval corruption of that classical tradition? Yet the puzzle becomes even more complex when the actual evidence of the use of these signs in early medieval manuscripts is studied: several authors, such as Hincmar of Rheims, Florus of Lyon, Lupus of Ferrières, and his student Heiric of Auxerre use sets of signs which match their own effort in marking-up texts. These individuals also reflect upon their practices, and describe the signs and their function. Obelus and theta (θ), for example, are generally used to express a negative comment on

the text: they mark passages which, according to the annotator, should be read with the utmost caution only, because of their faultiness in the sense of a corrupt text transmission. These signs could also express a dissent of the annotator with the content of the text, exclaiming, as it were, 'beware, reader, this is wrong'! Asterisk or *chrisimon*, on the other hand, are generally used to mark approval, or noteworthy content, just as the multiple forms of an abbreviated *Nota*. A close study of individual manuscripts, however, quickly reveals that there are exceptions to these common rules, that many more symbols are used than defined by the ancient tradition, and that individual scholars or writing communities used their own internal systems for mark-up.

Irene van Renswoude, who studied the manuscripts that reflect the heated theological debates of the ninth century, unearthed a fine set of examples in which different sets of signs are used and explained in prefaces.²⁰ Evina Steinova has done considerable work on the practice of annotating text with signs in general as part of her PhD thesis (expected completion in 2015).²¹ Her important first conclusion is that the accepted scholarly narrative about it is in need of thorough revision. Whereas the traditional view regards the deployment of these non-verbal annotation signs as an ancient practice of which only a few corrupted remnants survived in the Middle Ages, the margins of ninth-century manuscripts testify that the practice was very much alive. The practice of using the classical set of signs for textual criticism did not die with the Roman Empire, nor the theoretical thinking that surrounded them. On the contrary: new practices, signs and meanings were invented, described, and deployed. It is much more fruitful, therefore, to regard the medieval afterlife of these signs not as imperfect, incomplete, and corrupted ver-

20. For a first sample, see Renswoude and Steinova, 'The Annotated Gottschalk: Symbolic Annotation and Control of Heterodoxy in the Carolingian Age'.

21. For a first sample, see Steinova, '*Psalmos, notas, cantus*: the Meanings of *nota* in the Carolingian Period'.

22. Genette, *Seuils*.

23. Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores*. Bernard d'Utrecht. Conrad d'Hirsau: *Dialogus super auctores*.

sions of the great classical tradition, but to see them at their own merit. The margins show a practice in constant evolution and development, with an ever-growing set of signs and meanings full of nuance. A multitude of signs and systems of signs were used, and some scholars or scribal communities were keen to establish their own methods. Steinova's analysis of these is forthcoming.

Commentary Traditions

A second type of scholarship which is often encountered in the margins of Carolingian manuscripts of the classics is the commentary: a secondary text or set of texts copied next to the main text, in order to give the reader some guidance in the interpretation of the main text. The term *paratext* has been suggested to be used for this type of text, since commentary functions as a gateway between the physical text and the reader, offering supplementary information and giving direction as to how the reader should interpret the words in front of him.²² Commentary texts provide information concerning vocabulary, grammar, and syntax; they elaborate on the content of texts so as to give the reader more background information, for example concerning mythology or etymology; and they expound the lessons that should be drawn from the main text. A common form of *paratext* found in medieval margins is the short introduction to the author, his life and his work – the so-called *accessus*.²³

The nature of commentary texts is notoriously difficult, because of their fuzzy boundaries and their open-endedness. In the case of commentaries, it is not standard to have a transmission of a set text from a certain author on a certain text. Instead, the manuscripts often contain a selection made from that commentary, expanded by a set of com-

mentary texts that come from another source (or sources), or by a set of new commentary texts. These texts are almost always layered, in the sense that a first layer is entered into the marginal space surrounding the main text block, and that second, third or more layers are entered into this same marginal space in contemporary or later hands. Intermediate copies of these layered texts in a single hand, moreover, make it impossible to distinguish between the layers. Even in the few cases where the name of an author is attached to a commentary, for example the commentary of Servius on Virgil or the commentary of Donatus on Terence, a look at the individual manuscripts of these ‘authorized’ commentary texts often reveals a level of variance from copy to copy which is very hard to match with the idea of a ‘set’ text. For the making of editions, the classical philological approach often fails, or, in any case, results in a real struggle, as was most vividly described by James Zetzel:

24. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance*, 157.

Instead of a single original, there are many; instead of an archetype, there are multiple forms constantly present and transmitted in overlapping patterns; instead of mechanical copying from one manuscript generation to the next, there is pervasive contamination and horizontal transmission. And instead of a unified and unequivocal text, commentaries deliberately contain alternative and mutually contradictory explanations of the text they purport to explain; there is not one text, but many; there is not one truth, but many.²⁴

To attach a date to a commentary text thus becomes an unsolvable puzzle, for whereas it is possible to identify quotes and sources that give a reliable *terminus post quem*, this ter-

minus is only valid for the layer of the commentary to which the particular passage belongs, and layers are more often than not inextricably mixed on the pages of the surviving manuscripts.²⁵

Separate Annotations Versus Running Commentary Texts

In the Carolingian copies of Virgil, Terence, Persius, Lucan, and Martianus Capella (to mention just a few of the authors who were generally accompanied by extensive commentary traditions), main text and commentary text were brought together on the page in such a way that it was obvious which was which. The main text was written in the centre of the page (the main writing space), the commentary in the space around it. Often, this space was prepared for the purpose: columns for commentary were pricked and ruled next to the main writing space. The hierarchy between the two texts was clarified by scaled letter sizes: almost always, a larger letter was used for the main text, and a smaller-sized letter for the commentary. In most cases, both marginal *and* interlinear space was used for commentary, and as one would expect, shorter annotations generally feature in interlinear space, longer annotations in the margin. A widespread phenomenon is the usage of reference signs, which point the reader to the keyword or phrase ('lemma') to which the explanation ('interpretamentum') should be attached. Sometimes the lemma is repeated before the interpretamentum, sometimes not. For the reference signs, different styles of signs could be used: letters from the Latin or the Greek alphabet, reading signs such as dots or asterisks, Tironian notes, musical notation symbols, and newly invented graphemes. Many of these are illustrated in VLQ 18, a composite manuscript with

two codicological units, one (fols. 1-68) produced in the second half of the tenth century, the other (fols. 69-90) in the eleventh century, both possibly in Auxerre. The first unit contains a copy of Juvenal's *Satires*, with the so-called *Commentum Cornuti*, the second, a copy of Persius' *Satires*, also with commentary. The neat layout of text and commentary text is typical for the tenth century and later, as is the variety of signs used (Plate 2).

The open-endedness and layering of commentary texts resulted in different kinds of layout in the manuscripts. Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, a fifth-century handbook for the Greek learned tradition on the seven liberal arts, for example, comes with a complicated history of commentaries. Even after long and detailed research, it is unclear whether *De nuptiis* came to the Carolingian period with a fifth- or sixth-century commentary attached, or whether the Carolingian scholars were the first to build a commentary around it. The oldest manuscripts of the text we have date to the ninth century, so on the one hand there is no evidence to assume that an earlier phase of commentary preceded the surviving one, at least not by centuries. On the other hand, the commentary tradition is already present in the oldest exemplars of the text, and in these same manuscripts the layout of the text clearly provides space for the lengthy commentary found there, which could suggest that a commentary already accompanied the text when it reached the Carolingian intellectual centres where it was copied. In the earliest surviving copies of the text extra columns are provided for. The sources of the oldest commentary tradition include Servius, Boethius, Fulgentius, and Isidore, but also Church Fathers such as Augustine and Ambrose. Occasionally, contemporary names and references are found among the annotations in the mar-

26. Teeuwen, 'Writing Between the Lines'.

27. Teeuwen, 'Glossing in Close Co-operation'.

gin, but it is unclear whether these should be considered part of the original commentary or as later additions.²⁶

One of the oldest manuscripts with a rich transmission of the earliest commentary tradition is VLF 48, a manuscript that was perhaps made in Auxerre in the period 820-840 (Plate 3). The opening page shows a central writing space for the main text and two columns for annotations around it. The upper and lower margins are also filled with annotations, just as the small inner and outer margins around the commentary-columns, and the interlinear space, which is extra wide for the purpose. In this particular example, the commentary text found in the prepared commentary columns was written by two scribes who worked closely together. The two hands, who are quite similar, are mainly distinguishable by differences in the colour of their ink and the width of the nibs of their pens. Apart from these differences in appearance there seems to be no clear division in terms of roles or tasks in their copying activity. Both hands copied annotations in the interlinear space *and* in the marginal space, both hands corrected each other. They were two scribes working together, simultaneously and on equal terms, and they used one or more exemplars to enrich the text with commentary. In doing so, they relied upon a more or less fixed commentary text, which they copied rather faithfully into the margins of VLF 48. In other words: the commentary text found here is not a set of ad-hoc-annotations of individual scholars, but a text with a written transmission from one manuscript to another, even when the contours of the text are more flexible than usual.²⁷ A third hand, however, who entered an extra layer of annotations in the inner and outer margins (but mostly in the first few pages), seems to enter more ad-hoc, personal annotations: his script looks less formal, and contains a relatively

high number of Tironian notes. Annotations added by this third hand are not present in most of the other manuscripts with the oldest commentary tradition.²⁸

In the case of VLF 48, the commentary text took the shape of small blocks of text spread across the page. These blocks of text can only be understood in relation to the lemmata they reflect upon, and their spacing generally matches the occurrence of the phrase to which the annotation should be linked. In other cases, the commentary has taken the form of a continuous text, with lemmata incorporated into the running text and explanations following. This is the case, for example, in a later Martianus Capella manuscript with a commentary ascribed to Remigius of Auxerre, BnF, lat. 7900A, famous for its pictures of the seven liberal arts.²⁹ Here, the commentary is written continuously in a separate column, which is, in fact, at times wider than the text column. Lemmata are incorporated in the text and only distinguished from their interpretamenta by the use of capitals for the lemma and lower case for the explanation. Such a commentary can almost be read separately from the text, and, indeed, often makes an effort to be clear even to a reader who does not have the main text at hand. The fact that these running or continuous commentary texts were used in a more independent fashion is also evidenced by the fact that incongruences can be observed: a commentary text can, for example, reflect a different version of the main text (repeated in the commentary as lemmata) than present on the same page in the main writing space. Or the text on the page and in the running commentary are sometimes out of sync, when the lemmata incorporated in the commentary are found on a different page. In order to explain these incongruences, Zetzel introduced the term ‘remarginalized commentary’: a

28. O’Sullivan, *Glossae aevi carolini in libros I-II De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, LXVII-LXVIII.

29. Mutherich, “‘De Rhetorica’”. Eine Illustration zu Martianus Capella’.

30. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance*, XXX.

31. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance*, 155; Teeuwen, 'The Impossible Task of Editing a Ninth-Century Commentary Tradition', 197-8.

commentary text started in the margin, relying heavily on the lay-out and presence of the main text on the same page, but evolved to a text which could function more or less separately from the main text.³⁰ It was perhaps also copied in separate manuscripts. At some point, however, a scribe decided to bring main text and commentary together on the same page, and started to copy the commentary text next to the main text: he 'remarginalized' it. Since commentary text and main text did not necessarily share a common text tradition, however, incongruences could come into existence.³¹

There are several formats in between these two extremes: there are cases where separate blocks of text at some point start to grow into a running text; or, by contrast, where a running commentary starts to fall apart into smaller blocks of text at some point. Sometimes, a set text is copied at the start, but after a few pages only a selection from the set text is copied. It is extended with elements from other texts. In these cases of mixture between set text and ad-hoc text, the boundaries between text block (for the main text) and margin often also start to blur. One could question the use of the word 'margin' for a writing space that is prepared (in that it is pricked and ruled) to contain a set text, even if it is only a secondary one, which is there to interact with the main text. Visually the page not only contains two (or more) texts, main work and its commentary, but a hierarchy of primary and secondary texts can be discerned as well. The margin, in this case, would be the 'white area' around the second writing space, and not the second writing space itself. On the other hand, the 'second writing space' is seldom consistently used for a set commentary text. Very often, new layers, individual annotations, corrections, and variant readings creep in. A common feature is that a text is copied with a set sec-

ondary text from the outset but after a number of pages the layout is abandoned or put to different use. For example, the commentary columns pricked and ruled to contain the commentary are, in fact, used for the copying of the text itself; the commentary is driven to the edges of the pages. Or the columns are still there but remain empty: there is no commentary present. In some cases, the columns are used for other texts, presumably because they were left empty. It was considered a waste not to use them for a better purpose than being blank.

It seems fair to conclude, then, that the preparation of the layout, the pricking, and ruling of the quires, were not always considered leading: it could be overruled by the scribe, and the page could be adapted to better match the text that was to be copied on it.

32. Ganz, 'On the History of Tironian Notes', 50-1.

Tironian Notes and Personal Annotations

A phenomenon that is part and parcel of the genre of commentary texts, especially in the ninth century, is the relatively widespread use of Tironian notes.³² Tironian notes are signs from an ancient shorthand system, believed to have been invented by Cicero's scribe Tiro so that he could notate his master's speeches at dictation speed. The system survived and was used in the context of administration and law by professional scribes in the early Middle Ages. Among complete manuscripts in Tironian notes, Psalters stand out, and were probably used as training manuals: the Psalters, so it is argued, were known by heart and these texts were therefore very apt to train the eye for the Tironian signs. As for other textual genres, a more extensive use of Tironian notes is quite rare, presumably because they were mainly used for drafts and not for finished products of writing; and the survival

33. Holtz, 'Le ms. Lyon, B.M. 484 (414) et la méthode de travail de Florus'; Hellmann, 'Stenographische Technik in der karolingischen Patrologie'.

34. Hellmann, *Tironische Noten in der Karolingerzeit*, 54-92.

35. <http://www.rzuser.uni-heidelberg.de/~mw8/sntz/n/in-cipit.htm>, accessed May 2014.

rate for drafts, one can safely assume, is much lower than for finished products. In commentary texts, however, Tironian notes are frequently used, presumably for various reasons: not only could the shorthand script have been used to compensate for the lack of space, but it has also been suggested that these texts, which must have functioned in a context of school or private teaching, reflect an oral aspect. They could have been the notes used by a teacher to lecture, or the notes taken by students listening to their teachers and writing down their words. On the other hand, it is hard to imagine a student being allowed just to take notes in a manuscript, for writing manuscripts was an activity that was organised in a strict and hierarchic fashion.³³

Two things are clear on the usage of Tironian script in early medieval manuscripts: they are a testimony to education at the highest level and to a certain professionalism of the scribe. Moreover, they have a personal touch. The script, as Hellmann explained, is a basic set of strokes and curves signifying a certain syllable, and the individual elements are connected to make words. The connections, however, are personal: different forms can be used to connect one element to another, which makes it very difficult to read the Tironian shorthand of a person with whom one is not familiar.³⁴ Hellmann's online dictionary of Tironian notes, the *supertextus notarum tironianarum*,³⁵ starts from the basic elements and allows the user to follow their transformation when connected to other elements to form words. Yet it is still very difficult to solve the Tironian writing found in the manuscripts because the connections found in the margins of manuscripts only rarely match precisely the ones given by the dictionary.

The personal aspect of Tironian writing fits the character of commentary with its fuzzy, open boundaries well.

An individual scholar may have felt welcome to add his own thoughts in a manuscript that already contained a commentary tradition on a main text, precisely because the nature of commentary texts was open to adding layers of information. The use of Tironian shorthand, furthermore, suggests that he did so for private use, or at least for a select audience, namely those familiar with his style of writing Tironian notes and his marginal textual practices. The fact that he was – evidently – allowed to write in a manuscript at all furthermore confirms the speculation that he belonged to a highly educated scholarly elite of professional scholars, a circle of advanced students and teachers.

Apart from the use of Tironian notes for concise, perhaps personal commentaries, the shorthand script was also used to code certain remarks about the texts at hand. We have already seen how Lupus of Ferrières used the Tironian sign for ‘alter’ and Tironian ‘antiquus’ to mark variants he came across when consulting several copies of the same text. Tironian notes meaning ‘hic’ or ‘usque hic’ were frequently used in the margin, perhaps to make an unobtrusive note for a scribe who was to export text from one copy to another; or by a copyist who marked his own progress of the day; or by a reader who had read a certain text up to a certain point. We encounter other signs of a similar personal nature, for example in a manuscript of Seneca’s letters, BnF, lat. 8658A (Fig. 1).³⁶ This manuscript was produced in the second half of the ninth century in Northern France (Tours and Rheims have both been suggested) and was annotated by Heiric of Auxerre or someone from his circle in the 860s or 870s, under the abbacy of Hincmar of Rheims. The margins are full of personal signs: nota-signs, crosses, obeli, require-signs (check-signs), and keywords. These marginal activities reveal a scholar who

36. A digital facsimile is available at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bt-v1b8426791q>, accessed May 2014.

philosofus et literatus potest fieri ueniens roget quare de epicuro
 tam multa benedicta referam potius quam in; quid; tam qua
 re tam multa epicuri uoces putat esse publicas quam multa per dicitur
 quare philosophis aut dictas aut dicenda; Non autem gametracos
 nec togatas nras habentem hanc quoque; aliquid seueritatis; & sine
 comedia accorago sed uas medicum quod antea dissertissimorum uersum
 intermi; os iacit quam multa publicus non ex calceatis sed quotur
 natis dicenda sunt uersum quid philosophiam proinde & ad
 hanc partem quare modo fuit in manibus; referat quoniam for
 tuita in uero habenda; diuinit; omne quicquid optando euenit;
 hunc uersum accedens paulo melius sed adstrictus memini;
 Non enim faciemus quod fecit tuum; illud & iam nunc melius dictum
 autem per teibo; Da bonum quod potuit auferri potest; hoc enim
 in putos soluit de tuo tibi UALE

Ammetto rophen dat inquad a epistola epicuri seos quidi
 cant sapientem seipso esse contentum & propter hanc amico non indige
 re desiderasse; hoc obicitur saluti ab epicuro & in quibus;
 summum bonum uisum; Animum in patientia in ambiguitate inci
 dendum; si ex primere a phathian uno uerbo cito uoluerim;
 in patientia dicere; Propter contentum etiam uerum quod signi
 ficare uolumus; intellegi; nos eum uolumus dicere; quies puer
 omnis malis sensum; accipi & is qui nullum ferre possit malum;
 Vide ergo non satis sit aut in uulnereabilem animum dicere;
 aut animum extra omnem patientiam positum; hoc in nos & illos
 inter; Nos ter sapienter uincit quidem in contentum omne sed sentat;
 illum in sentat qui de illud nobis illis commune a sapientem
 seipso esse contentum sed tam & amicum habere uult & uicini & co
 gubernalem; quous sibi ipse sufficiat Vide quare sit contentum

studied the text for its Latin, who marked the content with keywords so as to navigate with ease through the text, and who added personal remarks triggered by the text. He noted points of interest, textually problematic passages and points that ought to be checked or that raised questions. The marginal activity in this manuscript is not of an explanatory nature, but a reflection of a scholarly and individual engagement with the text.

Conclusions

In the present essay examples have been shown of the textual practices used by scholars and students to mark up their texts of classical and late-antique authors. We studied the methods and techniques of textual criticism, the comparison of text versions, and the process of notating them in the margin or interlinear space. These techniques, driven by a general pursuit for textual correctness and accuracy in the copying process, were built on ancient practices, but Carolingian scholars developed their own systems of signs and markings as well. We saw examples of commentary, which was both transmitted as a set text from manuscript to manuscript, and open to a certain kind of layering, addition, and transformation. Commentary texts, so it was argued, are almost always the result of a dynamic process, and their shape and content are only rarely fixed. The nature of commentary texts firmly puts the classical authors in the context of education: their margins and interlinear spaces are full of annotations that focus on a correct text, grammar, syntax, poetic techniques, rhetorical figures, vocabulary. There is usually a strong emphasis on Greek vocabulary, which is marked with colours or lines, and explained. A second important goal of the marginal annotations seems to have been to organise and summarize

the text for the reader: definitions are repeated in the margin, keywords are added to make it easier for the reader to find his way, concise tables are shaped to make pieces of learning more memorable. Third, it is very obvious that the knowledge in one text was usually connected to that of others. Authorities on certain subjects are collected in the margin, and compared with each other.

This last characteristic of commentary texts – a critical comparison – enriches the setting of the study of these texts. Traditionally, books with annotations or commentary traditions are seen as schoolbooks, but they should also be seen as books of scholarship, scholarly discussions, and dossiers for scholarly disputes. This context of private scholarship is also reflected by the examples of private annotations in the form of critical signs, selection marks, and nota-signs. These make sense to their maker and his (or her) close circle, but they are often meaningless to those further removed. Precisely these annotations, I argue, are intriguing sources to study the intellectual history of the time. They bring us as close as possible to the monk or scholar who wrote them with his quill. Familiar hands have been recognized, such as the hand of Lupus of Ferrières, Florus of Lyon, John the Scot Eriugena, or Heiric of Auxerre. Each of them has been shown to have his own set of peculiarities when it comes to annotating, correcting or guiding the process of copying texts. These peculiarities reveal the specific scholars or their close intellectual circles, and make it possible to study contacts, networks or travels of these scholars and their books. By studying the annotations, we can analyze which subjects caught their attention, and which did not. Which parts of the ancient learned heritage did they adopt, which parts did they transform into something new, and how did they do this? Which parts did

they ignore or reject? We can analyze the nature of their comments on certain subjects, and the dynamics of the methods used to interpret them. We can follow the history of thought on certain subjects and see continuities and discontinuities. There is, in other words, a wealth of information still to gain from the voices in the margin.

Bibliography

- Bischoff, B., 'Libraries and Schools in the Carolingian Revival of Learning', in M. Gorman, trans. and ed., *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 93-114; originally published as 'Die Bibliothek im Dienste der Schule', in *La scuola nell'Occidente latino dell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 19 (Spoleto, 1972), 385-415
- , 'Benedictine Monasteries and the Survival of Classical Literature', in M. Gorman, trans. and ed., *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 134-60; originally published as 'Das Benediktinische Mönchtum und die Überlieferung der klassischen Literatur', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens* 92 (1981): 164-90
- Büren, V. von, 'Auxerre, lieu de production de manuscrits?', in S. Shimahara, ed., *Études d'exégèse carolingienne: autour d'Haymon d'Auxerre* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 167-86
- Charlier, C., 'Les manuscrits personnels de Florus de Lyon et son activité littéraire', in *Mélanges E. Pothier*. *Études de sciences religieuses offertes pour son éméritat* (Lyon: Facultés Catholiques, 1945), 71-84; repr. in *Revue Bénédictine* 119 (2009): 252-67
- Chazan, M., and G. Dahan, eds., *La méthode critique au Moyen Âge* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006)
- Contreni, J.J., 'The Carolingian Renaissance: Education and Literary Cul-

- ture', in R. McKitterick, ed., *The New Cambridge Medieval History II: c. 700-c. 900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 709-57
- Ferrari, M., "In papia convenient ad Dungalum", *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 15 (1972): 1-52
- Ganz, D., 'Lucretius in the Carolingian Age', in C.A. Chavannes-Mazel and M.M. Smith, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use* (Los Altos Hills, London: Anderson-Lovelace, Red Gull Press, 1996), 91-102
- , 'On the History of Tironian Notes', in P. Ganz, ed., *Tironische Noten, Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter Studien* 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 1990), 35-51
- Genette, G., *Seuils* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1987); trans. by J.E. Lewin as *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Hellmann, M., 'Stenographische Technik in der karolingischen Patrologie', in J. Becker, T. Licht, and S. Weinfurter, eds., *Karolingische Klöster. Wissenstransfer und kulturelle Innovation, Materiale Textkulturen* 4 (Berlin: De Gruyter, forthcoming)
- Holtz, L., 'Le ms. Lyon, B.M. 484 (414) et la méthode de travail de Florus', *Revue Bénédictine* 119 (2009): 270-315
- Huygens, R.B.C., *Accessus ad auctores. Bernard d'Utrecht. Conrad d'Hirsau: Dialogus super auctores* (Leiden: Brill, 1970)
- Jocelyn, H.D., 'The Annotations of M. Valerius Probus', *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series 34:2 (1984): 464-72; 35:1 (1985): 149-61; 35:2 (1985): 466-74
- McNamee, K., *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri*, *Papyrologica Bruxellensia* 26 (Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1992)
- Mostert, M., 'The Tradition of Classical Texts in the Manuscripts of Fleury', in C.A. Chavannes-Mazel and M.M. Smith, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use* (Los Altos Hills, London: Anderson-Lovelace, Red Gull Press, 1996), 19-40

- Munk Olsen, B., 'The Production of Classics in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in C.A. Chavannes-Mazel and M.M. Smith, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use* (Los Altos Hills, London: Anderson-Lovelace, Red Gull Press, 1996), 1-18
- , *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, 3 vols. (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1982-1989)
- Mütherich, F., "De rhetorica". Eine Illustration zu Martianus Capella', in J. Autenrieth, and F. Brunhölzl, eds., *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff: zu seinem 65. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (Stuttgart: Hierseman, 1971), 198-206
- Pellegrin, É., 'Les manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières. À propos du ms. Orléans 162 (139) corrigé de sa main', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 115 (1957): 5-31
- O'Sullivan, S., *Glossae aevi carolini in libros I-II De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 237 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010)
- Renswoude, I. van, and E. Steinova, 'The Annotated Gottschalk: Symbolic Annotation and Control of Heterodoxy in the Carolingian Age', *Collection des Études Augustiniennes* (forthcoming, 2015)
- Reynolds, L.D. et al., eds., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983; repr. with corrections, 1986)
- , and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968; 2nd edn., 1974)
- Steinova, E., 'Psalmos, notas, cantus: The Meanings of *nota* in the Carolingian Period', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* (forthcoming)
- Sullivan, R.E., 'Introduction: Factors Shaping Carolingian Studies', in R.E. Sullivan, ed., *"The Gentle Voices of Teachers". Aspects of Learning in the Carolingian Age* (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1995), 1-50

- Teeuwen, M., 'Writing between the Lines: Reflections of Scholarly Debate in a Carolingian Commentary Tradition', in M. Teeuwen and S. O'Sullivan, eds., *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella. Ninth-Century Commentary Traditions on 'De nuptiis' in Context* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 11-34
- , 'Glossing in Close Co-operation: Examples from Ninth-Century Martianus Capella Manuscripts', in R.H. Bremmer Jr and K. Dekker, eds., *Practice in Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Middle Ages*, Mediaevalia Groningana, New Series 16 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 85-99
- , 'The Impossible Task of Editing a Ninth-Century Commentary: The Case of Martianus Capella', *Variants* 6 (2007): 191-208
- Tura, A., 'Essai sur les *marginalia* en tant que pratique et documents', in D. Jacquart and C. Burnett, eds., *Scientia in margine. Études sur les marginalia dans les manuscrits scientifiques du Moyen Âge à la Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 2005), 261-387
- Vezin, J., *Observations sur l'origine des manuscrits légués par Dungal à Bobbio*, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung 32 (Munich: Ardeo Gesellschaft, 1982)
- Zetzel, J.E.G., *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance. The commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 84 (London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2005)
- Ziolkowski, J.M., and M.C.J. Putnam, eds., *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008)

Aut serpens calcata
Maiestas teritur. blusq
Non coniunx. non ipse
Sufficiunt odus. non e
Non notos egisse sat est
Funditus. & nomen ge
Nec celeris ^{perunt} loeto. crud
Supplicis fruttur.
Dilato mucrone para
Larcendi rabies. cono

The Transmission of Tibullus in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries

Robert G. Babcock

Tibullus was not the most widely read of the classical Latin poets during the Middle Ages. The earliest surviving complete copy of his poems dates to the 1370s.¹ The lack of medieval manuscripts of Tibullus' elegies seems to be an accurate reflection of their medieval scarcity, not an unfortunate accident of fate; for he is rarely quoted from or alluded to by medieval authors, and his name seldom occurs in medieval booklists or inventories. Tibullus was not, however, completely unknown to the Middle Ages. His poems are recorded in one of the earliest extant medieval booklists, a manuscript associated with Charlemagne's court circle;² and faint echoes of his poems have been adduced in poems written at Charlemagne's court.³ More significant for medieval knowledge of Tibullus, however, was the inclusion of excerpts of some of his poems in medieval florilegia, in particular in the *Florilegium Gallicum*. Tibullus even enjoyed something of a revival in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries through such anthologies.⁴ In addition to the inclusion of his work in various florilegia of that period, Tibullus was also known to several scholars at Fleury and in the Loire valley in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as Richard Rouse and Michael Reeve have documented.⁵ His popularity at that time and in that region, as Francis Newton

1. A succinct survey of the Nachleben of Tibullus is provided by Rouse and Reeve, 'Tibullus', 420-5.

2. See note 10, below.

3. Newton, 'Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia', 284 and notes 77 and 78 on the poetic exchange of Paul the Deacon and Peter of Pisa. See also Garrison, 'Alcuin and Tibullus', 749-59, on echoes in Alcuin.

4. Ullman, 'Tibullus in the Mediaeval Florilegia', 128-74; Newton, 'Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia', 253-86; Rouse, 'Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors', 131-60.

5. Rouse and Reeve, 'Tibullus', 421-2.

6. Newton, 'Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia', 283; Ullman, 'Tibullus in the Medieval Florilegia', 131, 133.

7. Newton, 'Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia', 256-86.

8. As Newton notes, ('Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia', 284), the Freising florilegium as a whole combines the grammatical focus with an interest in proverbial *sententiae*, although the Tibullus excerpts in that manuscript show relatively little of the interest in proverbs. The Venice florilegium – in both its Tibullus excerpts and in its excerpts from other authors – is much more narrowly focused on grammatical points.

noted, resulted from the renewed interest in Ovid and in love poetry in general.⁶

Newton also discussed the earlier manuscript evidence for Tibullus, which consists of two eleventh-century florilegia (BSB, Clm. 6292, the Freising florilegium, and Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Z. Lat. 497, the Venice florilegium). These he characterized as grammatical florilegia.⁷ They are the oldest manuscript witnesses to Tibullus, and they differ from the later florilegia in treating Tibullus' poems as models for grammar, prosody, and style. They show less interest in the content of his poems.⁸ Newton's study documented that we can divide the medieval reception of Tibullus into different periods with varied interests in and understandings of Tibullus' poems. In other words, in spite of the paucity of manuscripts of Tibullus' poems and of documented readers, there were actually distinct schools of interpretation of Tibullus during the Middle Ages.


The present study focuses on the reception of Tibullus in the tenth and eleventh centuries. It highlights the crucial, but hitherto neglected, rôle of the schools in the diocese of Liège in the transmission of Tibullus in this period; and it discusses a previously undetected reader of Tibullus, Egbert of Liège (fl. 1020). From various strands of evidence – booklists, manuscripts, readers' annotations, and quotations by medieval writers – I argue that it is possible to identify in tenth- and eleventh-century Liège a new and distinctive school of interpretation of Tibullus.

The Transmission of Tibullus Before the Twelfth Century

A review of what is known about the transmission of Tibullus before the twelfth century provides a clearer picture of how little known Tibullus was, and consequently, how exception-

al it is that he was read in the Liège schools in the tenth and eleventh centuries. More importantly, this review indicates that the diocese of Liège was central to the transmission of Tibullus before the twelfth century. Table 1 presents the reception of Tibullus between the eighth and the twelfth centuries as outlined in *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, and it illustrates how the authors of the essay on Tibullus in that volume, Richard Rouse and Michael Reeve, understood the relationship of the various bits of evidence from surviving manuscripts and references in medieval booklists.⁹ The sigla are explained below the table.

Table 1



- A = a lost Carolingian (or older) manuscript recorded in the booklist in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez.
 B. Sant. 66: ‘*Albi Tibulli lib. II. Horatii Flacchi Ars poetica... Glau-
 diani De raptu Proserpinae lib. III... Ad Rufinum lib. II. Claudii In
 Eutropium lib. III. De bello Gothico. De bello Gildonico...*’ (Aachen?,
 late eighth century)
 B = the Freising florilegium with extracts from Tibullus and Claudian’s
In Rufinum, *In Eutropium*, *De bello Gothico*, and *De bello Gildonico*
 (BSB, Clm. 6292, eleventh century)¹⁰

9. This is not a *stemma codicum*, but a graphic illustration of various sorts of evidence for the transmission of the text of Tibullus and how they relate to one another (reflecting the information included in Rouse and Reeve, ‘Tibullus’, 421-2). I am grateful to my son, Joseph J. Babcock, for creating these tables.

10. A complete scan of the manuscript is available online at http://bibliotheca-lau-reshamensis-digital.de/view/bsb_clm6292, accessed 22 June, 2014.

11. An error in the (seventeenth-century surviving copy of the) Lobbes booklist; read: 'In Eutropium'.

12. The Lobbes booklist was discovered and edited by Dolbeau, 'Un nouveau catalogue', whose transcription I follow. It is also included in Derolez, *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii*, nr. 103. The Lobbes codex also included 'Persius cum Cornuto super ipsum Persium'.

13. Bischoff, 'Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen', 149-69. B.L. Ullman first published a complete scholarly edition of this catalogue, 'A List of Classical Manuscripts', 24-5. Beyond the booklist, the Diez manuscript includes many texts, some of them authored by scholars active at Charlemagne's court; so the manuscript has connections to someone at that court (even if the booklist was added by that person elsewhere). The debate has recently been summarized by Kottje, 'Ein Zeugnis für die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen?', 45-9. See also McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, 365-8.

C = the florilegium of Lawrence of Amalfi with extracts from Tibullus (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Z. Lat. 497, central or northern Italy, eleventh century)


D = a lost manuscript from the abbey of Lobbes, recorded in a booklist of the abbey: '*Claudiani in Rufinum lib II. Eiusdem in Aegyptium*¹¹ *lib II. Eiusdem de bello gothico lib I. De bello gildonico lib I. Albini Tibulli lib III... Vol I*' (twelfth century)¹²

E = the *Florilegium Gallicum* and other florilegia, excerpts, and annotations (Loire valley, twelfth to thirteenth centuries)

Rouse and Reeve, summarizing earlier work on the reception of Tibullus, present the evidence from this period – aside from the Venice florilegium, here labeled C, whose relation to the other items is unclear – as depending, in some fashion, on a lost manuscript of the late eighth century, labeled A in Table 1. That manuscript is mentioned in a medieval booklist that Bernhard Bischoff connected with the Carolingian court library (c. 800), though this attribution has been much debated in recent years.¹³ Leaving aside the question of the location of the library described in that booklist, the important point here is that Rouse and Reeve present this manuscript, perhaps the only one to have survived from antiquity, as the source – after a gap of three or four centuries – for the later dissemination of Tibullus' poems in Germany, Belgium, and France (items B, D, and E, respectively, in Table 1).

The relationship among A, B, and D is revealed by the fact that Tibullus is transmitted in these witnesses in the company of a peculiar group of poems by Claudian (*In Rufinum*, *In Eutropium*, *De bello Gothico*, *De bello Gildonico*, always in that order). There is only one other witness to this particular group of Claudian poems in this particular order, an eleventh-century manuscript, now Brussels, Bibliothèque

royale de Belgique, 5380-84, from the abbey of Gembloux (prov. Namur, diocese of Liège).¹⁴ That the lost Carolingian manuscript lies behind nearly all of the surviving evidence from this period is not in question. It is, however, possible to provide greater detail about how directly some of the descendants of A relate to it, and to each other, and this in turn gives a clearer understanding of the transmission of Tibullus in our period; see Table 2.



F = quotations of Tibullus by Heriger of Lobbes
 G = quotations of Tibullus by Egbert of Liège

Table 2 adds two items that are not represented in Table 1: the quotations of Tibullus by Heriger, a monk and later abbot of the monastery at Lobbes (prov. Hainaut, diocese of Liège);¹⁵ and the quotations by Egbert of Liège, whose use of Tibullus is presented below. These are items F and G, respectively. In Table 2, additionally, I have moved D from the twelfth century to the middle of the tenth. Rouse and Reeve present the Lobbes booklist as information on the twelfth-century circulation of Tibullus, following the date of the relevant section of the original compilation of

14. The connection between the Tibullus and Claudian manuscripts recorded in the Carolingian booklist (A) and the contents of the Freising florilegium (C) was first made by Newton, ‘Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia’, 280-1. The Gembloux Claudian manuscript does not include Tibullus, and there is no evidence that it ever did.

15. First identified by Köpke in his edition of Heriger’s *Gesta episcoporum*, 189.

16. Dolbeau, 'Un nouveau catalogue', 8-10. The surviving manuscript of the Lobbes booklist is a seventeenth-century copy of an original that Dolbeau dates before 1160.

17. Babcock, *Heriger of Lobbes and the Freising Florilegium*, 180.

18. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 219-28; Balau, *Les sources de l'histoire de Liège au Moyen Âge*, 118-46.

19. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 535-9; Balau, *Les sources de l'histoire de Liège au Moyen Âge*, 153-4.

20. Rädle, 'Adalbold von Utrecht', 41-2; Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 743.

the Lobbes booklist, according to its discoverer and editor François Dolbeau.¹⁶ The Lobbes manuscript of Tibullus is itself lost, so its date is not known – except that it must be earlier than the booklist in which it is recorded. However, the fact that Heriger quoted from Tibullus in a work he wrote in the 970s, indicates that Lobbes already had a manuscript of Tibullus by that date.¹⁷ Heriger was renowned in his lifetime as a teacher of the liberal arts, and he may have taught both at Lobbes and in the city of Liège, where he was a trusted councilor to bishop Notger (d. 1008).¹⁸

Egbert was educated in Liège during Notger's episcopacy, and may have encountered Heriger in Notger's retinue.¹⁹ Egbert dedicated his *Fecunda ratis* to Adalbold, bishop of Utrecht (d. 1026), who had been his fellow student when both were young. Adalbold spent some of his career at Lobbes and was connected to Heriger; he may have been one of Heriger's students.²⁰ Egbert, Adalbold, and Heriger all belonged to the circle of bishop Notger in the last decades of the tenth century and the first years of the eleventh. Heriger must have known Tibullus from the Lobbes manuscript, and the presence of that manuscript at Lobbes may reasonably account for Egbert's knowledge of the poet as well.

Table 2 also differs from Table 1 in showing the Freising florilegium as directly dependent on the Lobbes manuscript, rather than on the Carolingian manuscript (from which it is indirectly descended). This relationship is clear from several circumstances. First, the order of the works in the Freising and Lobbes manuscripts is the same, with Claudian preceding Tibullus. In the Carolingian booklist, by contrast, Tibullus appears first. Further, it seems that the Tibullus and Claudian codices recorded in the eighth-century booklist are not parts of the same volume but rather separate volumes.

The entries for Tibullus and Claudian are not consecutive in that booklist, for there is a Horatian work (the *Ars poetica*) intervening between them,²¹ as well as another work of Claudian's, *De raptu Proserpinae*, that is not present in the Lobbes or Freising manuscripts. Even if the court codex was a composite volume that included all four of these texts (which would be an unparalleled combination), the Freising florilegium reflects the composite volume listed in the Lobbes booklist much more closely than it does the entries listed in the Carolingian list.²² I have argued elsewhere that the Freising florilegium was compiled at Lobbes, that Heriger used an ancestor of it, and that he was possibly himself the compiler of it.²³ In sum, the Freising florilegium is connected more directly to Lobbes than to the library described in the eighth-century booklist.

From Table 2, then, we can see that a far more important rôle in the transmission of Tibullus in this period must be assigned to the Liège schools, in particular to the now lost manuscript that was once in the library of the abbey of Lobbes. The eighth-century codex, wherever it was located, was not directly responsible for the dissemination of the text of Tibullus from Bavaria to Belgium to Central France over a period of three or four centuries. Instead, one of its descendants, a manuscript at Lobbes by the tenth century, accounts for most of the reception of Tibullus in this early period.²⁴

Egbert of Liège and His Borrowings from Tibullus

I now turn to Egbert and his borrowings from Tibullus. Egbert is thought to have been born around 970 in the area of Liège. He became a teacher in one of the schools in the city, and was the author of a schoolbook, the *Fecunda ratis* (*The Well-Laden Ship*), which he wrote for use in his own class-

21. Rouse and Reeve (421) speak of the Tibullus, Claudian, and Horace entries in the Carolingian booklist as parts of a single codex; but there is no evidence that this was so; and for the reasons outlined here, it seems to me improbable. Cf. also Babcock, 'A Revival of Claudian in the Tenth Century', 216.

22. See Babcock, *Heriger of Lobbes and the Freising Florilegium*, 155-58; Babcock, 'A Revival of Claudian in the Tenth Century', 212-5.

23. Babcock, *Heriger of Lobbes and the Freising Florilegium*, 170-96.

24. To be sure, there is no necessary reason that the manuscript at Lobbes could not have been the same manuscript that had been listed earlier in the Carolingian booklist, but there is no evidence one way or the other on this point. Even if it was the same manuscript, it was from Lobbes that the text of Tibullus entered circulation, not from the collection of the eighth century, wherever that was.

25. See Brunhölzl and Worstbrock, 'Egbert von Lüttich', 361-3; Babcock, *The Well-Laden Ship*, xii-xv.

26. Voigt, *Egberts von Lüttich Fecunda ratis*.

27. For example, Peiper, review of *Egberts von Lüttich Fecunda ratis*, 423-30; Manitius, review of *Egberts von Lüttich Fecunda ratis*, 426; Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur*, 538-9; and in the notes in Babcock, *The Well-Laden Ship*, passim.

28. Cited from Babcock, *The Well-Laden Ship*, 188, 236-7.

room.²⁵ The *Fecunda ratis* is a collection of versified proverbs, folktales, and religious instruction; and Egbert gathered his material from a wide range of biblical, classical, and medieval authors. His quotations and borrowings are extensively catalogued in the apparatus to Ernst Voigt's edition of the work,²⁶ and additional sources have been identified in subsequent scholarship.²⁷ Still, much remains to be done in this area. The passages below, drawing on Tibullus, have not, so far as I know, been identified or discussed in previous studies. The words in bold should be compared with the excerpts from Tibullus 1.1 that follow:²⁸

Divitias mundi cur quisquam colligere instat,
quandoquidem nec stare potest, qui colligit, auctor?
Cursum quisque brevem *vitae* consideret huius,
suffitietque sibi *contento vivere paucis*.
Longa quidem desideria *increpat* haec brevis *hora*,
cogitur incassum servata pecunia *multa*,
cum iuxta est, quo pergitur, et non longius absit!
(Egbert, *Fecunda ratis*, 2.63-69)

Gratia summa dei me suffitienter et apte
ditavit reliqua cessante *cupidine* carnis,
panniculos prebens panemque, nec amplius opto;
unde deum, non quemquam hominem formido
minantem,
quorum verba, minas *pluviis* et comparo *ventis*.
Dat natura modum *contento vivere paucis*;
Qui mundi lucris inhiant, ut corpora curent,
Non animas, ibi vinea Christi *inculta laborat*.
(Egbert, *Fecunda ratis*, 2.588-595)

Compare Tibullus 1.1:

<i>Divitias</i> alius fulvo sibi congerat auro Et teneat <i>culti</i> iugera <i>multa</i> soli, Quem <i>labor</i> adsiduus vicino terreat hoste, Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent: Me mea paupertas <i>vita</i> traducat inerti,	5
...	
Iam modo iam possim <i>contentus vivere</i> parvo Nec semper <i>longae</i> deditus esse viae, Sed Canis aestivos ortus vitare sub umbra Arboris ad rivos praetereuntis aquae. Nec tamen interdum pudeat tenuisse bidentem Aut stimulo tardos <i>increpuisse</i> boves,	25 30
...	
Quam iuvat inmites <i>ventos</i> audire cubantem Et dominam tenero continuisse sinu Aut, gelidas hibernus aquas cum fuderit Auster, Securum somnos igne iuvante sequi. Hoc mihi contingat. Sit <i>dives</i> iure, furorem Qui maris et tristes ferre potest <i>pluvias</i> .	45 50
...	
Te spectem, suprema mihi cum venerit <i>hora</i> ,	59
...	
Hic ego dux milesque bonus: vos, signa tubaeque, Ite procul, <i>cupidis</i> volnera ferte viris, Ferte et opes: ego composito securus acervo Despiciam <i>dites</i> despiciamque famem.	75

In both of these passages, Egbert has created an abbreviated version of Tibullus' first elegy. He reworked the Tibullan poem, taking from it aspects that he considered positive, like the re-

29. An additional encouragement for the change was probably Horace's use of *content[us] paucis* (at *Satires* 1.3.16 and 1.10.74), although Horace uses the phrase in metrical positions in his lines different from the positions in Tibullus and Egbert.

30. Library of Latin texts, [electronic resource], Cross Database Searchtool, Brepolis, <http://clt.brepolis.net/cds/>, accessed 23 February, 2014.

jection of wealth and the praise of a simple life. But whereas Tibullus urges his lover to forsake riches in order to become his mistress in his rustic cottage, Egbert instead proposes rejecting money in order to serve God and ensure salvation.

The half-line *contento vivere paucis* appears in both sections of Egbert, and is the key link to Tibullus. Though taking the phrase from Tibullus, and maintaining the same verse position for it that he had found in Tibullus, Egbert has altered the final word *parvo* to *paucis* – changing the word, but not altering the meaning significantly. In the first instance, we can see, I think, why Egbert made the change. He was multiplying the series of opposites (short/long, many/few, near/far). This encouraged changing *parvo* ('small') to *paucis* ('few') to stand in opposition to *multus* ('many').²⁹ The change from *parvo* to *paucis* does not hinder our ability to recognize the Tibullan verse that Egbert is quoting. Neither *content[us] vivere parvo* nor *content[o] vivere paucis* occurs elsewhere in the database of the 'Library of Latin Texts'.³⁰ In the first passage quoted above, Egbert introduces his reworking of Tibullus 1.1 by taking the crucial first word of Tibullus' poem, *Divitias*, and placing it in the same verse position in his line (2.63). Egbert's entire line, in fact, reflects the meaning, but not the exact wording, of Tibullus 1.1.1: 'the amassing of wealth is to be avoided'.

It is a common practice of Egbert's to treat the same subject or material twice, in slightly different ways, in different parts of the *Fecunda ratis*, as he does here in his reworkings of Tibullus. Both of our passages occur in the second book of the *Fecunda ratis*, which is divided into separate poems each with its own title. The first passage above (2.63-69) is part of a poem called *De immundo spiritu*, and Egbert's argument in the poem is that worldly goods impede us in the

struggle against Satan. The second passage (2.590-595) is a poem entitled *De sufficientia vitae*, and as the title indicates, it describes what is truly essential for humans in this life: God's grace, not worldly possessions or pleasures.

Tibullus is certainly not the principal model for these verses of Egbert's; he did not set out to create a version of the Tibullan poem. Like many sections of the *Fecunda ratis*, especially the second book of it, the passages in question here are a versification of moralizing lessons from the Church Fathers. These particular passages are drawn from Gregory the Great's *Homiliae in evangelia*. Egbert seems to have begun with a verse from the Gospel of Luke (9:25): *Quid enim proficit homini si lucretur uniuersum mundum, se autem ipsum perdat et detrimentum sui faciat?* He elaborated this by reference to Gregory's exegesis of the passage in Homily 32 (the passages in bold are borrowed by Egbert):³¹

Nam **cur instet** ad colligendum, **quando stare non potest**
 ipse **qui colligit?** **Cursum** ergo suum **quisque consideret**
 et cognoscit sibi posse sufficere
 parua quae habet. Sed fortasse metuit ne in **huius uitae**
 itinere sumptus
 desit. **Longa** nostra **desideria increpat** uia **breuis, incas-**
sum multa
 portantur **cum iuxta est quo pergitur.**

Egbert takes much of Gregory's wording verbatim. What is fascinating about his composition, however, is that Egbert recognized that similar sentiments had been expressed in a very different context in Tibullus' first elegy. He combined the ideas and language of Gregory with those of Tibullus.

Egbert adapted Tibullus' text in interesting ways, and

31. The portions of Egbert's poem, *De in-mundo spiritu*, that precede the passage from it quoted here, namely, *Fecunda ratis* 2.55-62, are also a versification of a section of Gregory's Homily 32 (ch. 2).

it is useful to examine some of his alterations in greater detail, for they show that Egbert is creatively engaging with the Tibullan text, not simply stealing a few phrases out of context. For instance, in the first line, he modifies Tibullus' *divitias* by adding the term *mundi*. He wants to distinguish between 'the riches of the world', which are bad, and 'the riches' of God's grace, which are good. He may have in mind a passage like Ephesians, 1.7 or 1.18 where the same word, *divitiae*, is used of the riches of God's grace. That Pauline Epistle begins with the word *Gratia*. So also does Egbert's poem *De sufficientia vitae*, in which his second reworking of Tibullus 1.1 occurs: *Gratia summa dei* (2.588). Perhaps Egbert has adapted this from Tibullus 1.4.23: *Gratia magna Iovi*, making the necessary pagan to Christian alterations.

Another example of Egbert's creative adaptation of his model is his alteration of Tibullus 1.1.3. Tibullus says that the fear of war and its endless toil is not for him. Egbert turns this upside down, making the fear a positive thing. He says he fears God – which is proper for a Christian – rather than any threatening man (2.591); but he has no fear of toil, for nature will provide for him the means to live happy on a few things (2.593). The hostile forces of wind and rain, from which Tibullus will take refuge in his cozy cabin (1.1.45–50), are dismissed by Egbert along with the threatening man. Nature for him is a positive force.

Egbert cleverly mirrors Tibullus' *cupidis...viris* (greedy...men) with his own *cupidine carnis* ('lust of the flesh'). Egbert says he will be enriched when he gives up that lust. Tibullus (1.1.15–24, not quoted above) invokes various rural deities (Ceres, Priapus, the Lares), calling on them to give him food and wine. For Tibullus' array of rural gods, Egbert substitutes 'God's grace' (i.e. the Christian God's),

gratia summa dei, which he says will provide him with bread and clothing. He draws here especially on Matthew 6:25-31, which asserts that God will provide his followers with the necessary food, drink, and clothing. Tibullus' wine may have seemed to Egbert an inappropriate subject for the school-boys who were his primary audience, so he leaves drink out of the trio of benefits. His substitution of the humble *panniculus* for Matthew's *vestimentum* emphasizes the themes of poverty and sufficiency; it also recalls the *pannis* ('swaddling cloth') in which Mary wrapped her infant. So it is at the same time a more humble and a more 'godly' sort of clothing that Egbert names. Egbert neatly attaches this reference to bread and clothing to the mention of flesh/meat (*carnis*) that he had introduced in the previous line.

Particularly amusing is how Egbert changed Tibullus' 'acres of cultivated soil' (1.1.2) to 'the uncultivated vineyard of Christ' (2.595). Christ has no *iugera* in the Bible, but the Lord does have a *vinea*; so Egbert made the appropriate substitution.

Egbert critiques the details of Tibullus' text by his expansions, substitutions, and omissions. He adapted the pagan text to a specifically Christian context for a Christian audience, frequently by turning Tibullus' statements on their head. Egbert could have simply given his students the passages from Gregory to read; indeed, at some point in their schooling they would have studied Gregory's work. By rendering Gregory's text in meter, however, Egbert made it more attractive for young students and easier to memorize. By his intertextual play with Tibullus he gave his version more polish and more depth – more for his students to think about, analyze, and discuss. He extracts what he sees as good and useful in Tibullus – elegance, style, and adaptable

sentiments – and, at least in his own mind, he outdoes his predecessor by adapting his verses to a Christian message.

Further Evidence for How Tibullus was Read in the Diocese of Liège in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries

We might well wonder what brought Tibullus to Egbert's mind as an appropriate intertext for a reflection on a passage of Luke (or on Gregory's exegesis of that passage). Obvious parallels between erotic elegy and the Gospel message do not immediately leap to mind. But it seems Egbert had an appreciation of Tibullus different than ours. Egbert borrowed passages from Tibullus attacking riches and in praise of poverty or of a life of poverty. Tibullus, in Egbert's reading, was describing a way of life that resonated with Christian, perhaps especially with monastic, ideals. I do not imagine that many readers today, if asked what Tibullus writes about, would reply 'he attacks wealth and praises poverty'. But that is, I think, how Egbert might have described the content – or at least the interesting or useful content – of Tibullus. Egbert was not alone in reading Tibullus in this way; he shares this approach with Heriger of Lobbes. Heriger quoted verbatim a single line from the Tibullan corpus, 3.3.21: *Non opibus mentes hominum curaeque levantur* ('The minds and cares of men are not lightened by wealth'). Egbert found in Tibullus precisely the same content that Heriger had, suggesting his understanding was influenced by Heriger's teaching, directly or indirectly.

There is further evidence for this reading of the content of Tibullus' poems in contexts related to Heriger. This is provided by the Freising florilegium and by the manuscript of Tibullus listed in the medieval booklist of the abbey of Lobbes. First the Freising florilegium: Newton has described this as a grammatical florilegium, for many of the

extracts from Tibullus, as from the other poets whose work is included, were chosen for grammatical, prosodiacal, or lexical reasons. But as Newton emphasized, the compiler of the Freising florilegium combined an interest in grammatical questions with an interest in moral *sententiae*.³² Although the latter interest is less pronounced in the extracts from Tibullus than it is in those from some of the other authors included in the Freising florilegium (e.g. Juvenal and Horace), the *sententiae* extracted from Tibullus in the florilegium include: *Divitias alius fuluo sibi congerat auro/ Et teneat culti iugera magna soli* (1.1.1-2); *Me mea paupertas uita traducat inertii* (1.1.5); *Iam modo iam possim contentus uiuere paruo* (1.1.25); *At uos exiguo pecori furesque lupique/ Parcite, de magno preda petenda grege* (1.1.33-34); as well as the line quoted by Heriger (3.3.21).

Many of the phrases imitated by Egbert are also included in the brief extracts from Tibullus in the Freising florilegium. Indeed, the first three passages from Tibullus quoted above from the Freising florilegium occur within the space of four lines in the florilegium, and they incorporate Egbert's most extensive and striking borrowings from Tibullus, including his adaptation of 1.1.25. In light of what was said above about the connection of this florilegium to Lobbes and to Heriger, it is worth asking whether Egbert's familiarity with Tibullus was restricted to the few extracts of his work included in this florilegium. It seems to me that the answer is no, for the florilegium does not include many of the other words and images that Egbert shares with Tibullus' first elegy: fear of an enemy (a threatening man), the wind and rain, God(s) providing a humble sustenance. Egbert mirrors terms and phrases drawn from various parts of Tibullus 1.1, and he could not have gotten them all from the excerpts in

32. Newton, 'Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia', 284. It is not always possible to separate these two interests, since moral *sententiae* can be expressed in language that provides models of grammatical constructions as well as of elegant (in the classical sense) style.

the Freising florilegium alone. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that the florilegium made the first few lines of Tibullus' poem more widely known in Heriger's circle, and that his familiarity with these lines led Egbert to find, read, and rework the entire first elegy.

The Lobbes booklist may be seen as another reflection of the same understanding of Tibullus' poems that we find in Heriger and Egbert. As mentioned above, this booklist indicates that the poems of Tibullus and some of the major poems of Claudian were bound together in the same volume in the Lobbes library. The collocation of the Augustan love poet with the late-antique satirist is not an immediately obvious one; and so far as I know, no one has speculated in print about what led someone to include the two in the same codex. I would repeat again what I argued above, that there is no reason to think these texts were bound together in the eighth-century booklist (A in Tables 1 and 2). The manuscripts listed there seem to be separate codices. It was at Lobbes that these two authors were joined between the same covers.

The reason for associating the two poets, I would suggest, can be glimpsed in a medieval copy of Claudian, the manuscript which is today Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 5380-84. It was written at the Benedictine monastery of St Peter's at Gembloux, an abbey in the Liège diocese near the city of Namur. The collection of manuscripts at Gembloux was formed in the first half of the eleventh century, when one of Heriger's students, Olbert, served as Gembloux's abbot (from 1012-1048). Like many of the classical manuscripts that survive from eleventh-century Gembloux, the Claudian manuscript seems to have been copied from a Lobbes exemplar (the Tibullus portion of the Lobbes manuscript was *not*, unfortunately, copied along with Claudian).

Plate 4 shows an opening from this manuscript, from an early portion of the first work by Claudian in the codex, the first book of *In Rufinum*. Several passages are underlined or bracketed. Starting on the left hand page (fol. 44v), about half way down, the marked passages read: *fluctibus auri / Expleri calor ille nequit*, v. 186 ('Passion cannot be quenched by rivers of gold'); *Numquam diues eris, numquam satiabere quaestu*, v. 199 ('You will never be rich, you will never be sated by profit'); *Semper inops quicumque cupit. Contentus honesto...paruo*, v. 200 ('Whoever is greedy will always be poor. Content with an honest little...'); and *Haec mihi paupertas opulentior*, v. 204 ('This poverty is greater wealth to me'). On the facing page (fol. 45r), we find: *Vivitur exiguo melius*, v. 215 ('It is better to live on a little'). This last phrase is also the first passage from Claudian included in the Freising florilegium.

Few modern readers, I think, would identify attacking wealth and praising poverty as the theme of Claudian's *In Rufinum*. No more would they understand that as the subject of Tibullus' verses. But it appears that the Lobbes and Gembloux readers found this content in both works, and it is perhaps for that reason that the two poets were combined in the Lobbes codex. The date of the underlining and bracketing of lines in the Gembloux Claudian manuscript is not clear, but it is medieval or early modern. There are marginalia on the opening in question (fols. 44v-45r) in a mid-sixteenth-century hand, but it is not clear to me whether the ink used for the marginalia is the same as that used for the underlining. If the underlining is as late as the sixteenth century, we have evidence that this particular reading of Claudian's *In Rufinum* endured at Gembloux for a very long time.

The Liège school's reading of Tibullus as a poet who praises poverty and attacks wealth may have influenced the

medieval reception of Tibullus outside of the diocese and beyond the eleventh century. I mentioned above the *Florilegium Gallicum* (labeled E in Tables 1 and 2), a mid-twelfth century anthology which includes many lines from Tibullus and which was responsible for the wider knowledge of his poems in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Richard Rouse has convincingly associated the compilation and circulation of this florilegium with the Loire valley, in particular with the school at Orléans.³³ The Tibullus extracts in the *Florilegium Gallicum* are very different from those in the Freising florilegium. Instead of the brief, disconnected *sententiae* and grammatical, lexical, and stylistic phrases of the Freising collection, the *Florilegium Gallicum* shortens Tibullus' poems, but creates individual and coherent compositions of them; and it assigns individual titles to many of them. Berthold Ullman published the complete text of these revised, abbreviated Tibullan poems. The first one, drawn from Tibullus 1.1 but reducing the 78 lines of that elegy to 52 by deleting most of the erotic content, has the title *Tibullus libro primo de felicitate pauperis vite*. This title may indicate that the abbreviator of Tibullus who created the compositions in the *Florilegium Gallicum* was influenced to read Tibullus in this way through contact with manuscripts or scholars from the Liège region. If so, Table 2 above should be further modified to indicate that the circulation of Tibullus in the twelfth century in central France was also somehow connected to Lobbes or Liège.

In tracing the influence of the Liège schools on the medieval reception of Tibullus, we should look not only forward to the twelfth century, but also backwards to the eighth. In his review of the recent debates on the origin of the Carolingian booklist mentioned above (A in Tables

1 and 2), Raymond Kottje closes by favoring the association of that booklist with Charlemagne's court at Aachen, returning to the conclusions Bischoff had made decades earlier. And of particular relevance for the present study, Kottje points out that Aachen belonged in the Middle Ages to the diocese of Liège.³⁴ This region was ground zero for the preservation and circulation of Tibullus before the twelfth century.

34. Kottje, 'Ein Zeugnis für die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen?', 49.

35. See, for example, the comments by Putnam, *Tibullus*, 8-11, 49-50.

In conclusion, Egbert's understanding of Tibullus seems to reflect a more wide-spread, but previously unsuspected, reading and interpretation of Tibullus in the tenth- and eleventh-century schools in the diocese of Liège. These early students of Tibullus warrant our attention because they were among the first identifiable medieval readers of his poems. Even if many modern scholars will find their motivations for reading Tibullus alien and strange, most will, I imagine, grant that one of the distinctive things about Tibullus' elegies is that he sets them in the countryside, amidst rural simplicity not urban elegance.³⁵ The readers in Heriger's circle are not far from appreciating this aspect of his poems, but with a twist. The rural setting is more like a monastery and the Epicurean philosophy is replaced by Christianity. Essential aspects of Tibullus' poetry have been preserved and appreciated, but adapted to a medieval context.

Even after centuries of intensive work in the field of reception history there are still many medieval writers whose borrowings from and reworkings of ancient poetry have never been detected or discussed, medieval manuscripts whose annotations have not been analyzed, and – as the present essay has attempted to show – even schools of readers of ancient poetry who have not been recognized as such and

whose motivations for studying the classical poets have not been fully investigated. Work in this area today is greatly facilitated by the increasingly comprehensive databases of Latin texts, in particular the Library of Latin Texts and dMGH. One of the great pleasures of working in this area is that so many discoveries remain to be made, for much of the ground remains as unploughed as Tibullus' 'vast acres of uncultivated soil'.

Bibliography

- Babcock, R.G., 'A Revival of Claudian in the Tenth Century', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 37 (1986): 203-21
- , *The Well-Laden Ship. Egbert of Liège*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 25 (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2013)
- , *Heriger of Lobbes and the Freising Florilegium*, Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 18 (Frankfurt/M., Bern, New York: Lang, 1984)
- Balau, S., *Les source de l'histoire de Liège au Moyen Age: Étude critique* (Brussels: Lamertin, 1903; repr. 1982)
- Brunhölzl, F., and F.J. Worstbrock, 'Egbert von Lüttich', in K. Ruh et al., eds., *Die Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 2nd edn., 14 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1980), Vol. 2, 361-3
- Dekkers, E., 'Sigebert van Gembloux en zijn *De viris illustribus*', *Sacris Erudiri* 26 (1983): 57-102
- Derolez, A., et al., *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii. The Medieval Booklists of the Southern Low Countries, Vol. 4* (Brussels: Paleis der Academien, 2001)
- Digital Monumenta Germaniae Historica (dMGH), <http://www.dmgH.de/>
- Dolbeau, F., 'Un nouveau catalogue des manuscrits de Lobbes aux XI^e et XII^e siècles', *RecAug* 13 (1978): 3-36 and 14 (1979): 191-248
- Garrison, M., 'Alcuin and Tibullus', in M.C. Díaz y Díaz and J.M. Díaz de Bustamante, eds., *Poesía Latina Medieval (siglos v-xv)*, Actas del


- IV congreso del 'Internationales Mittellateinerkomitee', Santiago de Compostela, 12-15 de Septiembre de 2002 (Florence: SISMEL-Ed. de Galluzzo, 2005), 749-59
- Heriger of Lobbes, *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodiensium*, ed., R. Köpke, Monumenta Germaniae Historica SS 7 (Hannover, 1846), 161-89
- Kottje, R., 'Ein Zeugnis für die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen? Zu Inhalt und Herkunft der Bücherliste in der Hs. Berlin, SBB-PK Ms.Diez.B Sant. 66', *Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein* 212 (2009): 45-9
- Library of Latin Texts, Cross Database Searchtool, Brepolis Publishers, <http://www.brepolis.net/>
- Manitius, M., *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Vol. 2 (Munich: Beck'sche Verlag, 1923)
- , review of Voigt, 'Egberts von Lüttich Fecunda ratis zum ersten Mal herausgegeben auf ihre Quellen zurückgeführt und erklärt', *Romanische Forschungen* 4 (1891): 426
- McKitterick, R., *Charlemagne. The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Newton, F., 'Tibullus in Two Grammatical Florilegia of the Middle Ages', *TAPA* 93 (1962): 253-86
- Peiper, R., review of Voigt, 'Egberts von Lüttich Fecunda ratis zum ersten Mal herausgegeben auf ihre Quellen zurückgeführt und erklärt', *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 25 (1893): 423-30
- Putnam, M.C.J., *Tibullus a Commentary* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973)
- Rädle, F., 'Adalbold von Utrecht', in K. Ruh et al., eds., *Die Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, Vol. 1, 2nd edn. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1978), 41-2
- Rouse, R.H., 'Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth and Thirteenth-Century Orléans', *Viator* 10 (1979): 131-60
- , and M.D. Reeve, 'Tibullus', in L.D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Trans-*

- mission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 420-5
- Ullman, B.L., 'A List of Classical Manuscripts (in an Eighth-Century Codex) Perhaps from Corbie', *Scriptorium* 8 (1954): 24-37
- , 'Tibullus in the Medieval Florilegia', *CP* 23 (1928): 128-74
- Voigt, E., *Egberts von Lüttich Fecunda ratis zum ersten Mal herausgegeben auf ihre Quellen zurückgeführt und erklärt* (Halle A.S.: M. Niemeyer, 1889)

pronaru.

INUS RETHORICAE

F C U L T A S



Diagrams of Knowledge and Rhetoric in Manuscripts of Cicero's *De inventione*

Irene O'Daly

St Gall, SB, Cod. Sang. 817, a manuscript containing the *Cat-egories* and the *De interpretatione* of Aristotle, accompanied by the Boethian commentaries on these texts, contains a series of diagrams on its final leaves (Plate 5). Executed in black ink by an eleventh-century hand contemporaneous with the rest of the manuscript, with red boxes enclosing the labels, and red connecting lines, the three diagrams constitute a visual commentary on the Aristotelian categories.¹ The final diagram, a two-page spread labelled '*Qualitas*', has four labelled subdivisions which are '*Habitus et dispositio*', habits and dispositions; '*Naturalis potentia uel inpotentia*', natural capabilities and incapacabilities; '*Passibiles qualitates uel passionēs*', affective qualities and affections, and '*Formae et figurae*', shape. The latter three are expanded in the form of a list, with the fourth subdivision also illustrated with small sketches of the principal forms and figures. The subheading '*Habitus et dispositio*', on the other hand, is comprehensively expanded in diagrammatic form, extending its spidery divisions over a whole page. Within this category, the first subdivision is into the respective characteristics of the soul and of the body. The soul is

1. St Gall, SB, Cod. Sang. 817: *Substantia*, p. 341; *Quantitas*, p. 342; *Qualitas*, pp. 343-4.

2. '*Scientia in his duabus speciebus secundum uictorinum*': Victorinus, *Explanations in Ciceronis Rhetoricam*, I.4.5.

3. '*Sapientia in his duabus secundum modernos*'.

4. '*Uirtus et honestas et bonum idem sunt apud philosophos*', '*Turpitudine uitiū et malum idem sunt apud eosdem*'.

5. The Ciceronian division of the virtues and their associated parts can be found in Cicero, *De inventione*, II.LIII.159-LIV.165 [henceforth *De inv.*]. Cf. John Cassian, *Conlationes*, 5.10.

6. Newhauser, 'Vices as Anthropology', 109.

7. For the tradition of classifying knowledge, see Copeland and Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric*, 3-14; Weisheipl, 'Classification of the Sciences in Medieval Thought'; Weisheipl, 'The Nature, Scope and Classification of the Sciences'; Iwakuma, 'The Division of Philosophy'; Gibson, 'The *Artes* in the Eleventh Century'. For the tradition of depicting the classifications graphically, see Esmeijer, *Divina Quaternitas*, 43-7. On

further divided, and within this division the inclusion of an elaborate schema of the parts of knowledge, and of the virtues and vices, is of particular interest. The author of the diagram unusually alludes to the sources of his divisions. '*Scientia*' is divided 'according to Victorinus' into '*eloquentia*' and '*sapientia*'.² Within this division, '*sapientia*' is divided into theoretical and practical wisdom '*secundum modernos*' (the Aristotelian schemata).³ The third division enumerates the virtues and vices, drafted according to 'the philosophers'.⁴ Here, the cardinal virtues are divided according to the Ciceronian tradition, while the eight capital vices are derived from Cassian's *Conlationes*.⁵ The inclusion of the virtues and vices alongside the divisions of knowledge demonstrates a scholarly trend to consider ethics 'scientifically', which would reach fruition in the medieval universities where, as Richard Newhauser points out, the divisions of the vices, for example 'were transformed from an articulation of medieval anthropology into one scheme among others for academic examination'.⁶

Diagrams of the type found in Cod. Sang. 817 show a persistent interest in the definition of the parts of knowledge. The desire to present such definitions and divisions in schematic form, whether motivated by the purpose of memorization or efficient synthesis, has a long tradition that stretches back to antiquity, and was popularized for medieval scholars by the inclusion of schematic divisions in manuscripts of texts such as Cassiodorus' *Institutiones*.⁷ As Michael Evans wrote: 'Stemmata had become current in the medieval west not as adjuncts to texts, but as substitutes for them'.⁸ The focus of this article is to demonstrate how such schemes can contribute to our understanding of the intellectual environment influencing the study of Cicero's *De inventione* in the Middle Ages. It will investigate, first, a number of diagrams

of knowledge that are appended to manuscripts of the *De inventione*. Secondly, it will examine how rhetoric could be articulated in diagrammatic form, suggesting that schemes of this type served as a valuable introduction to the art, and were useful for understanding the principal tenets of the *De inventione* and other rhetorical texts.

Cod. Sang. 817, despite being a manuscript showcasing dialectical works, serves as a useful introduction to these themes. It demonstrates one of the principal ways of relating rhetoric to broader studies of knowledge, by placing it, along with the other arts of the trivium under the category ‘*eloquentia*’, a subdivision of ‘*scientia*’. The result of a conflation of this type, as Evans points out, is the simultaneous representation of the ‘Aristotelian’ *diviso philosophiae* alongside the verbal arts.⁹ Cod. Sang. 817, dating from the first half of the eleventh century, is an early example of this combination. In addition to including the arts of the trivium, the diagram also accommodates the subjects of the quadrivium in the following fashion. Wisdom, following the Aristotelian division, is divided into the practical and theoretical arts.¹⁰ The theoretical arts are presented here as physics, theology, and mathematics. Mathematics subdivides into arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy, the quadrivial arts. By placing mathematics and physics alongside each other as species of the same genus, this presentation reflects the contemporary teachings of Gerbert of Rheims (c. 946–1003). Gerbert, in opposition to Otric of Magdeburg (fl. 980), presented a similar *diviso philosophiae*, presumably in diagrammatic form, at the court of Otto II.¹¹ Meanwhile, the practical arts are identified as ethics, economics, and politics [*Ethica, id est moralis; Economica, id est dispensativa; Politica, id est civilis*].¹² By presenting a series of classifications (the virtues, the vic-

the mnemonic function of diagrams, see Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, 324–3.

8. Evans, ‘The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*’, 5.

9. Evans, ‘The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*’, 8.

10. Weijers, ‘L’Appellation des Disciplines’, 48–9.

11. Richer of Rheims, *History*, 46–54; Gibson, ‘The *Artes* in the Eleventh Century’, 121–4.

12. These divisions, derived from Aristotle, would find later articulation in the works of Hugh of St Victor, who would associate each of these activities with a different sphere of responsibility – solitary, private, and communal (*Didascalicon*, III.1; II.19).

13. *De inv.*, I.III.4-I.V.6.

14. Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, II, C.III.4-7; Isidore, *Etymologiae*, II.24.

es, the parts of the curriculum, the theoretical divisions of knowledge) simultaneously within the framework of the Aristotelian categories, the diagram allows rhetoric and the other disciplines of medieval scholarship to be understood in a broader intellectual context.

Diagrams of Divisions of Knowledge in Manuscripts of the *De inventione*

In the opening passages of the *De inventione*, Cicero identifies rhetoric with the science of politics, and links it with the acquisition of wisdom.¹³ This seems to have been an inspiration behind including diagrams of divisions of knowledge alongside copies of Cicero's *De inventione*, as it implies that rhetoric must be acquired alongside a broader education. The first example we shall investigate is found in VLQ 33, where a diagram appears directly following the explicit of the text, in the lower two-thirds of the page, filling the blank space (fol. 56r) (see Fig. 2 and Plate 6). The diagram, executed in the hand of the scribe who copied the text on that page, is written in black ink with carefully drawn blue circles enclosing and linking elements. The diagram bears the title '*Scientia in duo diuiditur*' in its principal node, and subdivides into '*sapientiam*' and '*eloquentiam*'. '*Sapientiam*' divides into two branches, '*speculatiua*' and '*actualis*'. These divisions would have been familiar to the medieval reader from a number of sources. Cassiodorus used the same system in his *Institutiones*, and it was reproduced by Isidore in his *Etymologiae*.¹⁴ The classification proceeds to divide '*speculatiua*', the more theoretical branch, into '*naturalis*', '*doctrinalis*', and '*diuina*'. The doctrinal division contains arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. Meanwhile, the practical branch, '*actualis*', contains '*moralis*', '*dispensatiua*', and '*civilis*' (the same divisions found in Cod. Sang. 817). Ev-




Fig. 2. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLQ 33, fol. 56r (scheme).

ans described this diagram as the ‘earliest extant example of this [visual] *divisio scientiae*’, dating it to the tenth century.¹⁵ Based on the hand, however, it is more likely that the manuscript dates from the early eleventh century, placing it roughly contemporaneous with the theoretical and practical divisions found in Cod. Sang. 817.¹⁶ Like Cod. Sang. 817, VLQ 33 is also connected with St Gall. Peter Gumbert associates the text of this copy of the *De inventione* with that found in St Gall, SB, Cod. Sang. 820.¹⁷ Furthermore, the codicological unit (fols. 1–56) containing the *De inventione* is coupled with a folio (fol. 58) containing a fragment of Cicero’s *De somnium Scipionis*, which comes from a tenth-century manuscript at St Gall (SB, Cod. Sang. 65, pp. 1–152), as identified by Barker-Benfield.¹⁸ Cod. Sang. 817 and VLQ 33, therefore, attest to the use of diagrams as functional learning aids in the scholarly environment of medieval St Gall in the early eleventh century.¹⁹

15. Evans, ‘The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*’, 8.

16. Suggested by the vertical aspect of the text.

17. Gumbert, ‘Cicero-nes Leidenses’, 226.

18. Barker-Benfield, ‘Review of *Codices Vossiani Latini*’, 252–3.

19. Grotons, *Reading in Medieval St Gall*, 80, 85.

20. Evans, 'The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*', 8.

21. Hicks, 'Martianus Capella and the Liberal Arts', 316-24 on the eleventh and twelfth-century commentary tradition on Martianus.

22. Evans, 'The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*', 8-9. Evans references BL, Egerton 628, fol. 2v. Cf. the classification of sciences found in Porto, Biblioteca Pública Municipal, Geral 21, fol. ov, pictured in Meirinhos, 'Dessiner le Savoir', 190.

23. William of Conches, *Consolatione*, 32; *Glosae super Platonem*, 60-2, Figs. 44, 62.

Evans describes the diagram in VLQ 33 as a 'graphic gloss on the *De inventione*' and its placement at the conclusion of the *De inventione* suggests, indeed, that it was intended to be read alongside this text, perhaps illuminating its opening passages, which refer to the origins of wisdom and eloquence.²⁰ A further source for its philosophical content, particularly its division of *scientia*, may be the writings of Martianus Capella, who linked eloquence to *sapientia* in a similar fashion.²¹ The influence of Martianus is reinforced by the fact that this copy of the *De inventione* is preceded by a miniature (fol. 1v) picturing Rhetoric in conversation with two figures attired in archaic clothing. Rhetoric, who wears a helmet and carries a spear, bears on her shield the words: '*Sum quippe ipsa rhetorica quam alii artem uirtutem alii dixerunt. alter disciplinam. Officium meum est dicere apposite ad persuadendum. Finis persuadere dictione*', a quotation from *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (Cap. 5, 438-9). Despite its inclusion alongside a rhetorical text, however, it is interesting to note that while the diagram in VLQ 33 references the arts of the quadrivium, it does not make any accommodation for the arts of the trivium, unlike the diagram contained in Cod. Sang. 817.

An expanded version of the division of *scientia* into *eloquentia* and *sapientia* would gather currency in a diagrammatic tradition Evans associated with the circulation of copies of Boethius' *De consolazione philosophiae*, where *eloquentia* was systematically expanded into *grammatica*, *dialectica*, and *rhetorica* and where music, a subdivision of mathematics, was in turn comprehensively subdivided in parts.²² This division of *scientia* is popular from the second half of the twelfth century; it finds notable expression in the commentaries of William of Conches (1090-1154) on the *Consolatione* and on the *Timaeus*.²³ This expanded set of divisions of *scientia* also

circulated independently of Boethius' texts, however, as the following examples illustrate. In BnF, lat. 18275 (an Italian manuscript from the second half of the twelfth century), for example, the diagram (fol. 26r) is one among several, including a diagram of the phases of the moon, sun, and planets (on fol. 25r), a small diagram showing the waxing and waning of the moon, and four roundels with the features of the cardinal virtues (on fol. 25v). In BPL 127 AC, the diagram (fol. 99r, Plate 7) appears on the reverse of another familiar graphical depiction, that of relations of consanguinity (fol. 99v). Here the executor of the diagram was guided in tracing its circular nodes by the outline of the circles of the consanguinity diagram visible from the verso through to the recto of the parchment sheet. These two instances demonstrate how diagrams of knowledge could become dislocated from their original textual context and rendered 'free-standing'. In the same way as the concluding pages of Cod. Sang. 817 could constitute an independent appendix on Aristotle's categories, so collections of information in diagrammatic form circulated both independently and in tandem with texts. Furthermore, these examples show how diagrams tended to 'breed' more diagrams.

VLQ 33 is not the only instance where the *De inventione* is presented alongside a diagram itemising the parts of *scientia* or *philosophia*. Sandwiched between the texts of the *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in Montpellier, BIU, H 335 (a late twelfth-century French manuscript, provenance Clairvaux), is a depiction of *Philosophia* (fol. 26r, see Fig. 3 and Plate 8).²⁴ Executed in blue and black ink, she is crowned and bears two lances. The base of each spear pierces one of the arts: '*ethica*' and '*phisica*', while in a literal demonstration of her dominance over the liberal arts her feet

24. See Munk Olsen, 'The Cistercians and Classical Culture', 120. The volume corresponds to an item in the Clairvaux catalogue (1472), but is not in the usual Cistercian style.




Fig. 3. Montpellier, Bibliothèque Inter-Universitaire, Section Médecine, H 335, fol. 26r (scheme).

25. BnF, lat. 18275, fol. 20r, discussed in Franklin-Brown, *Reading the World*, 76.

26. Reproduced in Wirth, 'Von mitteralterlichen Bildern und Lehrfiguren', Abb. 27.

rest on '*logica*'. The scheme classes the trivial arts under logic, while theology, '*mathesis*', and '*phisiologia*' are classed under '*phisica*'. Meanwhile, '*theorica*' and '*practica*' are regarded as part of ethics. The divisions of knowledge itemised here bear no direct relationship to the rhetorical texts that precede or follow the diagram.

The image of *Philosophia*-crowned was a common one, but there was substantial variation in the divisions such diagrams could contain. BnF, lat. 18275, discussed above, also contains a picture of *Philosophia* (fol. 20r), holding '*theorica*' and '*practica*' in her hands, and with her feet resting on '*logica*'. Here the image appears alongside the text of Fulgentius' *Mythologiae*. The folio is trimmed, but it is likely that '*logica*' originally had two, not three, divisions (as only two lines emanate from the node), perhaps subdividing into dialectic and rhetoric.²⁵ Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 1253 (dating from the second third of the thirteenth century) also depicts *Philosophia* as crowned (fol. 83v), no doubt associated with Boethius' description in the *De consolatione philosophiae*, the text alongside which this diagram appears.²⁶ As in the Montpellier manuscript, she presents a three-fold division of philosophy into '*phisica*', '*logica*', and '*ethica*'. The subdivisions are more complex here than in the Montpellier example, however. '*Logica*' divides into the three arts of the




Fig. 4. Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, III.E.30, fol. 193r (scheme).

trivium, and each art is further subdivided. Rhetoric, for example, is divided into ‘*natura*’, ‘*doctrina*’, and ‘*usu*’, divisions identified by Isidore in *Etymologiae*, II.3. These depictions of *Philosophia*-crowned demonstrate that while an image may remain iconographically consistent, it may become a vehicle for different classificatory interpretations. The inclusion of such a diagram in Montpellier, BIU, H 335 may say less about the *De inventione*, therefore, and more about the salience of the tradition of visualising *Philosophia* anthromorphically.

Like Montpellier, BIU, H 335, and VLQ 33, Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, III.E.30, an Italian manuscript of the *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, dating from the first quarter of the thirteenth century, also contains a diagram presenting the divisions of knowledge (fol. 193r) (Fig. 4). Following the conclusion of the second text, the diagram is decorated with pen flourishes in red and the dark ink in which the text was written. The principal node, ‘*Scientia*’, is defined by a series of oppositions: ‘*Artificiosa/Inartificiosa*’, ‘*Litteralis/Illiteralis*’, and ‘*Liberalis/Illiberalis*’.²⁷ These three divisions rest on top of a table itemising,

27. Similar divisions are found in Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, 399, fol. 29, see Helssig, *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig*, 625.

28. Hunt, 'Introduction to the "Artes"', 85. Copeland notes that the *De inventione* served as a 'substitute dialectical text' prior to the comprehensive reintroduction of the Aristotelian logical corpus (*Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation*, 159).

29. Particularly influential studies of Ciceronian rhetoric in the Middle Ages include Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric*; Carmago, 'Rhetoric'; Fredborg, 'Twelfth-Century Ciceronian Rhetoric', and the collection of essays recently published in Cox and Ward, eds., *The Rhetoric of Cicero*.

from left to right, '*Phisica*', '*Logica*', and '*Aethica*'. Bounding knowledge by suggesting what it is and is not, the scheme suggests that all ethical, 'physical', and logical knowledge should be polished, literate, and 'liberal'. Like the other diagrams classifying parts of *philosophia* and *scientia* appended to the Ciceronian rhetorical texts, this does not include any details on the specifics of rhetoric. Instead, the qualitative characteristics of *scientia* are given priority. The presence of these three diagrammatic divisions of knowledge alongside the Ciceronian rhetorical texts presents a conundrum, as they do not facilitate a conceptualisation of the art of rhetoric alongside other parts of knowledge, nor make any attempt to understand the relationship between the different parts of rhetoric, as itemised in Cicero's text.

Perhaps the paradox of their inclusion can simply be explained by considering the prominent place of the *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* in the medieval curriculum. As Hunt points out, 'One of the essential characteristics of the method of teaching used in the twelfth century is that the starting point is the exposition of the text of some ancient author, Donatus and Priscian for grammar, Cicero and the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* for rhetoric, and so on'.²⁸ As the principal textbooks for the study of rhetoric from the tenth century on, these were conterminous with the art, with scholarly focus less on the production of new, original, works on rhetoric, but rather on the production of extensive commentaries following in the footsteps of late-antique writers such as Grillius and Victorinus.²⁹ Such commentaries on the *De inventione* were occupied with the relationship between rhetoric and other arts; their prefaces sought to demonstrate how rhetoric contributed to what John Ward has termed 'total knowledge', even if the par-

ticular interpretation of knowledge assumed was divorced from the original context of composition of the text.³⁰ In this light, the diagrams already discussed may serve a similar function to these prefaces, seeking not simply to supplement the content of the *De inventione*, but to complement it by placing it within a broader intellectual context. Another plausible motivation for their inclusion is the existence of a broader tradition of including diagrams alongside copies of these texts, whether in their margins or subsequent to their conclusion. Around sixty manuscripts of the *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* contain diagrams, which complement and supplement the information of the text.³¹ These attest to the popularity of the use of diagrams in the study of rhetoric in the Middle Ages, a tradition which can be traced back to manuscripts of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones*, which often contained diagrams to illustrate the part of the text containing rhetoric, and the inclusion of diagrams in manuscripts of rhetorical commentary texts, such as those by Victorinus and Fortunatius. The text of the *De inventione*, in particular, seems to have been particularly suited to diagrammatic exposition due to its tendency to itemise, enumerate, and subdivide parts of rhetorical argument.

Diagrams of Rhetoric: A 'Visual Prologue'?

The remainder of this article shall focus on two rhetorical diagrams found in the collection of the Universiteitsbibliotheek in Leiden. Unlike the diagrams previously examined, each of these cases presents a comprehensive set of subdivisions of the parts of rhetoric. One is found alongside the opening of the *De inventione* (VLF 70), the second is independent of a rhetorical textual context, but is appended to a previously unidentified text on the divisions of knowledge that con-

30. Ward, 'The Medieval and Early Renaissance Study of Cicero's *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*', 27-32.

31. For preliminary observations on these diagrams found in rhetorical texts, see Munk Olsen, *L'étude auteurs classiques latins*, IV.1, 236. I am completing a monograph on diagrams associated with the *De inv.* and *Rhet. ad Her.*

32. Studies of the genre include Quain, 'The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores'; Hunt, 'The Medieval Introduction to the "Artes"'; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 9–39.

33. Sears, 'Portraits in Counterpoint', 61–2, 71.

34. Copeland and Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric*, 9.

35. Hunt, 'The Medieval Introduction to the "Artes"', discusses Types A–C, 94; Type D, 97.

36. For a description of this manuscript and a reconstruction of its accompanying parts now found in Orleans, BM, 277 (233) and BnF, *Nouvelles acquisitions latines*, 1630, fols. 14–16, see Pellegrin, 'Membra Disiecta Floriacensia', 9–16.

tained a number of schema (BPL 28). As well as investigating their content and presentation, and speculating on their sources, the diagrams shall also be regarded as a form of *accessus*, a genre of introductory texts to particular authors (the *accessus ad auctores*) or particular disciplines (the *accessus ad artes*) common in the Middle Ages.³² In her study of author portraits preceding a text, Elizabeth Sears coined the term 'visual prologue' by comparing how such portraits paralleled verbal prologues, the *accessus ad auctores*.³³ Can diagrams, which may serve an analogous function by introducing and providing information on how a text should be read, and a discipline understood, also be regarded as 'visual prologues'? Akin to the classifications of the sciences, which according to Rita Copeland and Ineke Sluiter had a 'normative force, establishing a curricular standard', the *accessus* to the arts suggested a particular way to contextualise and conceptualise a subject.³⁴ Precedent for the divisions used in *accessus* texts is found in the *De inventione* (1.IV.5): 'But before I speak of the rules of oratory, I think I should say something about the nature [*genus*] of the art itself, about its function [*officium*], its end [*finis*], its material [*materia*] and its divisions [*partes*]'. As Hunt's seminal article on the theme recognized, however, there was a number of alternative schemes of classifying the arts, which expanded and offered alternatives to the Ciceronian divisions.³⁵ The diagrams found in VLF 70 and BPL 28 may show further potential for the adaptation of these classifications in visual form.

VLF 70

The first example of the use of diagrams as a sort of 'visual prologue' to the text to be investigated is found in VLF 70 (Plate 9).³⁶ This tenth-century manuscript from Fleury

is laid out in two columns, and contains a series of marginal diagrams alongside the opening paragraphs of the *De inventione* (fols. 51rb-66va). Unfortunately, this leaf (fol. 51r) of the manuscript is damaged by mould, and the ink is faded and oxidised, so a complete transcription is impossible, but we can attempt to reconstruct the diagrams, five in number, which present a summary of the principal features of rhetoric.³⁷ Written in majuscules throughout, the diagrams present as a series of labelled circles accompanied by three annotations in rectangular boxes, extending along the outer margin of the leaf and into its lower margin. The hierarchy of the elements is enforced by their presentation; the circles are gradated into three sizes, providing a visual cue to their relations. The diagrams are best regarded in conjunction, as they share common features and themes.

The first circular node is preceded by a rectangular label, partially illegible, which reads '*materia rethoricae facultatis e<...> proposita ad dict<...>*'. It is entitled '*genus/facultas*'. Nesting below this circular node is a label entitled '*species*'. The first node divides into three categories: '*iudicialis*', '*demonstrativum*', '*deliberativum*'. Each of these is accompanied by a brief encircled label describing the responsibilities of the art.³⁸ '*Iudicialis*' consists '*in actione et defensione*', for example. This diagram is followed by the next, entitled '*partis facultas rethoricae*', which subdivides into the five parts of rhetoric, '*inventio*', '*dispositio*', '*elocutio*', '*memoria*', and '*pronuntiatio*'.³⁹ The next diagram is also preceded by a rectangular box labelled '*rethoricae facultas instrum <...oratio>*'. It refers to the '*rethorice orationis species*', that is, '*exordium*', '*narratio*', '*partitio*', '*confirmatio*', '*reprehensio*', and '*conclusio*'.⁴⁰ The '*opus*' of rhetoric is identified in the next rectangular box as '*docere et monere*' (*sic. mouere?*). The fourth diagram

37. In the transcription of the diagram angled brackets (<>) indicate where the text is no longer visible/partially visible. Within these brackets, letters/words which may be made out with the aid of a UV light are indicated in plain text. An ellipsis indicates where letters are present, but illegible. Spelling is inconsistent (eg. *rethorica*), as expected in a medieval context. The notation '*sic*' is only used to indicate circumstances where the spelling or grammar are particularly corrupted.

38. Cf. *De inv.*, I.V.7.

39. Cf. *De inv.*, I.VII.9.

40. Cf. *De inv.*, I.XIV.19.

41. Cf. *De inv.*, I.XV.20.

42. Cf. *De inv.*, I.XI.15.

43. For the school at Fleury in this period, see Mostert, *The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury*, 30-5. Information on manuscript production in Fleury can be found in Mostert, *The Library of Fleury*, 24-7.

44. Pellegrin, *Membra Dissecta*, 14. For further information on classical MSS associated with Fleury, see Pellegrin, 'La tradition des textes classiques latins'.

is entitled '*genera causarum*' and subdivides into '*honestum*', '*admirabile*', '*humile*' (the final two nodes are illegible, but presumably read '*anceps*' and '*obscurum*').⁴¹ The final diagram extends along the lower margin of the page and is labelled '*status causa<rum>...*' and subdivides into two branches.⁴² One label reads '*rationales sunt*', but the second label is cropped. The second branch was presumably headed '*legales sunt*', of which there are five subdivisions (four circles are visible, but only two can be read, '*amb<iguitas>*' and '*diffinitio*', as this section at the edge of the folio is badly damaged). The first branch has four subsidiary circles: '*coniectura*', '*finis*', '*qualitas*', and '*translatio*'. '*Qualitas*' stems into another, larger, node entitled '*iuriditiales*' (*sic. iuridicialis*) which contains further subdivisions. First, it divides into '*absoluta*' and '*assumptiva*', the latter then contains four further divisions: '*concessio*', '*rimatio*' (*sic. remotio*), '*relatio*', and a cropped node of which the first two letters can be read, which are '*co*', so presumably this read '*comparatio*'. The node entitled '*rimatio*', presumably a corruption of '*remotio [criminis]*', has two subsidiary nodes reading '*purgatio*' and '*deprecatio*'.

We know that this manuscript dates from a particularly rich period of manuscript production in Fleury, a time when its school was thriving under the direction of Abbo of Fleury.⁴³ As Pellegrin's reconstruction of the original content of the manuscript demonstrates, the text of the *De inventione* originally sat alongside the syllogistic treatise of Abbo himself, as well as the works of Aristotle, Porphyry, Apuleius, Cicero, and Boethius, among others, providing an insight into the state of the study of rhetoric and dialectic in Fleury in this period.⁴⁴ Abbo's personal interest in rhetoric is demonstrated by the account of his studies given in Aimoin's *Life of Abbo*. Aimoin explains that Abbo went to Rheims to

study rhetoric, but made no progress, so returned to Orleans, where he studied Victorinus' *Commentary* on the *De inventione*.⁴⁵ However, the diagrams on fol. 51r do not resemble any of those typically found in the commentary of Victorinus.⁴⁶ It is interesting to note that VLF 70 also contains an extract from another late-antique commentary on the *De inventione*, that of Grillius (fol. 10ra).⁴⁷ Some similarities of the text of the diagrams to book IV of Boethius' *De topicis differentiis* may be suggested. For example, the opening label ('*materia rethoricae facultatis e<...> proposita ad dict<...>*') may be derived from Boethius' definition of the material of the art of rhetoric: '*Materia vero hujus facultatis est, omnis quidem res proposita ad dictionem*', that is that the material of the art of rhetoric is the subject proposed for a speech.⁴⁸ The third label ('*opus rethorice docere et monere*') may also reference Boethius ['*Opus autem rhetoricae facultatis est docere movereque*'].⁴⁹ The identification of the work of rhetoric with the word '*monere*', to warn, is an apt alternative to '*mouere*', to move, so this may simply represent a misreading of the text. The summary *in toto*, however, cannot directly have its roots in Boethius' text; for one thing, book IV of the *De topicis differentiis* does not contain references to the '*genera causarum*' listed here, that is the honourable, difficult, mean, ambiguous, and obscure kinds of cases.

We cannot completely rule out the possibility that the diagrams depend on the text of the *De inventione* itself. Two other possible sources must be considered, however. The first is Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* where the section on rhetoric (II.2) was frequently accompanied by seven diagrams, including the five presented in VLF 70. However, all five diagrams are also found in another set of schemes circulating in this period, that is the set of diagrams that circulated along-

45. *Vita Abbonis*, PL 139. 390. BnF, lat. 7696 contains another copy of the *De inventione* from Fleury dating from the late tenth/early eleventh century coupled with a copy of the Victorinus commentary and the *Partitiones Oratoriae*, the *Praecepta artis rhetoricae* of Julius Severianus, and extracts from the *Institutio oratoria* of Quintilian.

46. Compare, for example, the nine 'standard' diagrams found in the copy of Victorinus in Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Misc. Class. 25, produced in Rheims in the same period.

47. Comm. 1, 1-5 (lines 1-23 of the introduction), 1-2 in Jakobi, *Commentum in Ciceronis rhetorica*.

48. *De top. diff.*, PL 64. 1207C.

49. *De top. diff.*, PL 64. 1208C.

50. The diagrams are printed in *PL* 101. 945–50. A discussion of the diagram tradition can be found in Knappe, *Traditionen der klassischen Rhetorik*, 171–6, and Knappe, ‘Classical Rhetoric in Anglo-Saxon England’, 13–15. See also *Clavis scriptorium Latinorum* II, 160–1 for a list of surviving manuscripts.

51. Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture*, 525.

52. For the possible Irish origins of the division of physics, see Bischoff, ‘Einteilung der Wissenschaften’, 18–19. On the contribution of the scheme to medieval interpretations of the virtues, see Bejczy, *The Cardinal Virtues in the Middle Ages*, 37.

53. See, for example, the copy of the Pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata in *PL* 101. 945–49, edited with reference to the 1541 edition of a manuscript from St Emmeram, now BSB, Clm. 14377 (fol. 26r). For other examples of the corruption, see: Valenciennes, BM, 404, fol. 51r; BSB, Clm. 6407, fol. 38r; BSB, Clm. 13084, fol. 24r; BSB, Clm. 14377, fol. 26r; Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, C 80, fol. 108r; St Gall, SB, Cod. Sang.

side Alcuin’s *De disputatio rhetorica et uirtutibus* (c. 794), a popular text in the ninth and tenth centuries.⁵⁰ This set of seventeen schemes has been described by Martin Irvine as ‘an attempt at building a unified model for all the arts and sciences’, a ‘Carolingian attempt to schematise what is implicit in Alcuin’s teaching and writing’.⁵¹ In addition to divisions of the parts of oratory, the set of stemmata also includes a discussion of the parts of physics, and a summary of the cardinal virtues.⁵² Some interesting similarities between these stemmata and the diagrams on fol. 51r of VLF 70 can be noted. In the first diagram the use of the judicial case of rhetoric is identified as ‘*in actione et defensione*’, not ‘*in accusationem et defensionem*’ as the Ciceronian/Cassiodorian tradition would hold, a corruption that is common in the copies of the Pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata.⁵³ Similarly, while the last diagram, the division of *status*, may derive from Cassiodorus’ *Institutiones* where a diagram entitled ‘*Status causarum aut rationales sunt aut legales*’ was commonly appended to the text, a version of it is also found among the pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata.⁵⁴ Not only do the Pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata invariably refer to ‘*remotio*’, rather than the expanded form ‘*remotio criminis*’ common in the Cassiodorian tradition, but an error found in VLF 70, fol. 51r is also shared by at least three manuscripts of the pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata.⁵⁵ All four divide ‘*remotio*’, rather than ‘*concessio*’, into ‘*purgatio*’ and ‘*deprecatio*’, a division that does not make sense and is a departure from Cicero’s text.⁵⁶

It is tempting to consider, therefore, the diagrams found in VLF 70 as a truncated version of the pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata. If that is the case, the combination of Cicero’s text alongside these Carolingian diagrams on fol. 51r represents an interesting juncture in the study of rhetoric, that is, a point

identified by Kempshall when Alcuin's *Disputatio de rhetorica* exerted a 'waning influence', as the rhetorical texts of Cicero and Quintilian began to be copied and sought out in their own right.⁵⁷ Whatever the source of the diagrams, they attest to the use of schematic reasoning in the school of Fleury, where diagrams appear to have been a common teaching and learning aid.⁵⁸ The diagrams serve as a useful summary of rhetoric appended to the opening of the most used classical rhetorical text. In identifying the genus, material, species, and purpose of rhetoric, their objective seems primarily to describe what is to follow in the text. Summarising, rather than systematising is the principal goal, but through their presence at the start of the text, the diagrams serve the secondary purpose of introducing the fundamentals of the text, and in so doing, introducing the art of rhetoric.

BPL 28

The diagram of rhetoric on fol. 2v of BPL 28 is part of a three-folia fragment appended to a copy of the works of Horace dating to the second half of the ninth century (Fig. 5 and Plate 10).⁵⁹ The fragment, which is not recorded in the most recent catalogue, dates from the eleventh century.⁶⁰ By the twelfth century, the manuscript was part of the collection of St-Pierre in Beauvais, as attested to by a contemporary *ex libris* on the first folio, which demonstrates that the fragment must have already been attached to the Horace work by this stage.⁶¹ The folia are in the wrong order; the correct order of the text is fol. 1r-v, fol. 3r-v, fol. 2r-v. The diagram on fol. 2v is, therefore, added at the end of the texts contained in the fragment, and is in a different, but contemporary hand to the rest of the fragment. The first text of the fragment (fols. 1r-v, 3r), previously unidentified, is a copy of a Carolingian short

273, p. 226; Cod. Sang. 64, p. 378 (here the text has been corrected to read 'accusatione'); Cambrai, BM, 168, 111 bis.

54. Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, II.2.4.

55. BSB, Clm. 13084, fol. 24r (Freising, ninth century); BSB, Clm. 6407, fol. 39r (Freising, ninth century); Valenciennes, BM, 404, fol. 51v (St Amand, ninth century).

56. Cf. *De inv.*, I.XI.15. It should be noted that I have found this error in two copies of the Cassiodorian schemes also – St Gall, SB, Cod. Sang. 820, p. 66, where it has been corrected and Kassel, UB, 4° Ms. philol. 3, fol. 85v. The error, which may simply be that, is easily made.

57. Kempshall, 'Virtues of Rhetoric', 8.

58. Barker Benfield, 'A Ninth-Century Manuscript from Fleury', 153–4; Saenger, *The Space Between Words*, 79, 160.

59. Gumbert, *IIMM*, 24. Cf. Tarrant, 'Ancient Receptions of Horace', 287 for revised dating of the manuscript to the tenth century.

60. Molhuysen, *Codices manuscripti*, III, identi-




Fig. 5. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 28, fol. 2v (scheme).

text containing a set of inscriptions and diagrams of philosophy with the incipit '*Philosophiae trifariae primo dividitur in Theoricam, Practicam et Logicam*'.⁶²

The text, with its accompanying diagrams, are found in a number of manuscripts.⁶³ The most comprehensive list is that of Evans, who refers to thirteen manuscripts containing the text (although he does not distinguish between those that contain the text and schemes, and those that contain the text alone, which is the case for BnF, lat. 7418, for example).⁶⁴ His list can now be supplemented, not only with the Leiden example, but also with St Gall, SB, Cod. Sang. 251, pp. 183-185, which includes the text and a series of diagrams at the conclusion of the manuscript. Evans suggests that the text and its associated diagrams are related to the Pseudo-Alcuinian stemmatic tradition, noting in particular Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 9565-66, where the texts appear in conjunction as an 'elaborate redaction' or 'enlarged version' of the pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata.⁶⁵ While it is true that in a number of cases the *Philosophiae trifariae* text and diagrams appear alongside the seventeen pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata, there are also a number of cases where the text and diagrams appear independently.⁶⁶ As the first three leaves of BPL 28 are a fragment, it is impossible to determine whether or not the text was originally appended to a copy of the pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata, but as the text starts about ten lines down the page, and follows a simple circular diagram (badly faded and unclear), we can determine that it was certainly not directly preceded by them.

The second text contained in the fragment is a series of extracts from Origen's *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (fols. 3v, 2r-v) The inclusion of parts of this text in conjunction with the *Philosophia trifariae* makes sense. The latter

fies it as '*Fragmenta rhetorica et theologica*', 17.

61. S[an]c[t]i pet[ri] belvacensis. Q.xvii at the bottom of the folio. At the top is a content list of the volume: '*Mecenas atavis. Ode. Ep[isto]le. et S(er)mones Horacii. Q.xvii*'.

62. See Bischoff, 'Einteilung der Wissenschaften', 5-6; Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 42-3.

63. Irvine says the text is 'probably a product of the early Carolingian renaissance' and notes its inclusion in two manuscripts containing grammatical texts (*The Making of Literary Culture*, 281-2). Note the attribution of the text to Jerome in Wells Cathedral, VC/II, a manuscript dating to the second half of the twelfth century, item 7 (fols. 2v-3), '*Incipit interpretatio ieronimi de philosophia. Philosophia tripharia primordio dividitur... fraudulentem et fictam*', Ker and Piper, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, Vol. 4, 567-69.

64. Evans, 'The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*', 7, n. 32.

65. Evans, 'The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*', 6. Derolez, 'Dubthach's

Cryptogram' contains an alternative reconstruction of Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 9565-66.

66. See, for example, Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Msc. Nat. 1, fols. 44r-45v; Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Misc. Ph. 1, fols. 51r-v; BSB, Clm. 14456, fols. 68r-69v; BAV, Pal. lat. 834, fols. 91r-92v.

67. On the medieval tradition of studying Origen, see Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved*, 34-41. Matter (at 35) notes that the commentaries are extant in thirty MSS, of which the earliest dates from the eleventh century.

68. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, 27.

69. *'Temptemus inquit prius de eo requirere... uel de amico uerbidi coniunctione dirigitur'*. The extract in the Leiden MS is slightly shorter and ends *'...in mutationibus agitur personarum'*. The Origen extract in Valenciennes, BM, 404 is introduced with the phrase *'Item quae ex his Origenis in Canticum Canticorum dixerit inserendum esse putauimus'*, the same introductory phrase found in BPL 28, fol. 3v.

text refers to the tropological, anagogical, and allegorical parts of *spiritualis*, a theme also found in Origen's *Commentary*. Origen associates the three books of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs) with the three parts of knowledge – ethics, physics, and logic – and, in fact, identifies this as the source of later Greek philosophical divisions.⁶⁷ This point seems to have been of particular interest, as the extracts (Prologue: III.1-7, 14-16; IV.3; Bk. 1.1) directly concern these neo-Platonic divisions of philosophy. The Origen extracts, when placed in conjunction with the *Philosophia trifariae* text act, to borrow a phrase from Minnis, as 'a conscious transition from secular to sacred', demonstrating a will to combine traditional definitions of knowledge derived from the classical heritage with Christian interpretations.⁶⁸ It should be noted that the *Philosophiae trifariae* text and the Origen extracts are found in combination in another manuscript, that is, Valenciennes, BM, 404.⁶⁹ This manuscript, owned by Hucbald of Saint-Amand, dates from the ninth century and contains a series of diagrams: the seventeen pseudo-Alcuinian stemmata (fols. 50v-55v), a diagram entitled *'Septem Sapientes'*, accompanied by a short text (fols. 56v-57r), followed by the *Philosophia trifariae* text (fols. 55v-60r) and the extract from Origen's *Commentary* (fols. 60r-61v).⁷⁰ The diagram on rhetoric added at the conclusion of the extracts from Origen in BPL 28 is already associated, therefore, with a particular classification of the parts of knowledge, one that combined elements of classical and Christian doctrine. In addition, as the content of the *Philosophiae trifariae* text 'depends on the stemmatic layout', in Evans' words, it may have provided an implicit prompt for considering rhetoric in schematic form, demonstrating again how diagrams tend to attract other diagrams.⁷¹

This diagram is simple in form, but surprisingly informative. Executed in black ink, it is carefully constructed. The structure of the diagram appears to have been drawn before the labels were added, which has led to compression of the text in some labels. This is also demonstrated by the fact that there were originally seven, not six, nodes branching from the element on the furthest right of the diagram. The extra node and connecting line have been erased, and there is no trace of erased text therein. This suggests that the scribe of the diagram had a clear idea of its structure and content before drawing it; it was not a spontaneous addition. The diagram is entitled '*Genus Rethoricae*', a title which rests on top of a rectangular box containing the word '*facultas*'. From this principal node stem six subsidiary nodes entitled respectively: '*actor quae orator*', '*rethoricae partes*', '*opera*', '*rethoricae specie*', '*materia*', and '*instrumentum rethorica artis id est oratio*'. This set of distinctions is derived from Boethius' *De topicis differentiis* IV: 'Accordingly we will talk about the genus of the art, [its] species, matter, parts, instrument, parts of the instrument, work, function of the speaker, the end – and after that about questions and Topics'.⁷² The subdivisions of the sections, in turn, also directly reference Boethius:

So the genus of rhetoric is discipline. There are three species of rhetoric: judicial, epideictic, and deliberative. The matter [of rhetoric] is the political question, which is called a case. The parts of this matter are issues. The parts of rhetoric are discovery, arrangement, expression, memorization, and delivery. [Its] instrument is discourse. The parts of the instrument are exordium, narration, partition, confirmation, refutation, and peroration. [Its] work is to teach and to move. The one

70. On Hucbald's collection and its provenance, see McKitterick, 'The Knowledge of the *Timaeus* in the Ninth Century', 93 who notes that Valenciennes, BM, 404 was at least bound at Saint Amand, if not made there.

71. Evans, 'The *Ysagoge in Theologiam*', 8.

72. *De top. diff.*, PL 64. 1207A: '*Dicemus itaque de generis artis, et speciebus, et materia, et partibus, et instrumento, instrumentique partibus, opere etiam officioque actoris et fine, post haec de quaestionibus ac de locis*'; trans. Stump, *De topicis differentiis*, 80.

73. *De top. diff.*, PL 64. 1211B-C: '*Quare genus est rhetoricae facultas. Rhetoricae vero species tres, iudiciale, demonstrativum, deliberativum. Materia autem civilis quaestio quae dicitur causa; partes huius materiae, constitutiones. Rhetoricae partes inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, pronuntiatio. Instrumentum oratio; instrumenti partes, exordium, narratio, partitio, confirmatio, reprehensio, peroratio. Opus est docere et movere; actor est orator; officium bene dicere; finis bene tum dixisse, tum persuadere*'; trans. Stump, *De topicis differentiis*, 87.

74. *De top. diff.*, PL 64. 1211B, directly preceding the summary.

75. Stump, *De topicis differentiis*, 142 for the resemblances between the texts. Of the corpus of manuscripts containing the *De inventione* and/or *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 27 contain book IV of *De top. diff.*: 2 from the tenth century, 4 from the eleventh century, 18 from the twelfth century. In the earlier MSS the work appears in combination with other Boethian texts, or extracts from other rhetorical works, such as the pertinent

who does this work is the orator. [Its] function is to speak well. [Its] end is sometimes to have spoken well, sometimes to persuade.⁷³

The work of the orator is divided into '*docere*' and '*monere*' (to warn), rather than the conventional '*movere*' (to move). A notation on the diagram, which appears to be in the same hand, adds '*uel mouere*', referencing this, more typical, division. Although in this summary, Boethius describes the *materia* of the art as '*civilis quaestio*', it should be noted that elsewhere in book IV Boethius lists the four Ciceronian divisions of the material of the art (*coniectura, finis, qualitas, and translatio*), as given in the diagram.⁷⁴ A note added at the base of the connecting lines under the node labelled '*materia*' reads '*partes materiae constitutiones*', reinforcing this connection. Boethius emphasized the fact that the genus of rhetoric was wholly in its species, just as the matter of rhetoric was in its species; he conceives of rhetoric as a system that is symbiotically dependent in all its aspects. In this respect, the diagram serves as a uniquely appropriate way to summarize the relations between all facets of rhetoric. Its drafter seemed to appreciate this, as he linked the secondary nodes of the diagram together, so they not only all stem from '*facultas*', but are also linked on the secondary level. Therefore, the diagram summarizes not only the content of Boethius' summary, but also the conceptual relationships construed by it.

Boethius' *De topicis differentiis* was a popular text, and the fourth book on rhetoric frequently circulated as an extract alongside the *De inventione*, presumably because the first half of the fourth book closely resembles, and serves as a summary of, the Ciceronian text.⁷⁵ The diagram in BPL 28, however, goes beyond exclusively commenting on the *De*

inventione, as interpreted through the medium of Boethius, and becomes a template for understanding the art of rhetoric as a whole; it is a visual *accessus*, or prologue, to the art. In the study of types of *accessus* to the art, Hunt identified a set of divisions ('Type D'), dependent on book IV of the *De topicis differentiis*, pointing out that it 'was only suited as an introduction to an art or a science, not to introducing the book itself'.⁷⁶ Hunt's conclusion that this type of *accessus* originated in the 1130s in the writing of Thierry of Chartres, who complemented it with a distinction between the 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic' parts of the art, was refuted by Ward, who suggested that rather than regarding Thierry as an innovator in this respect, we should instead recognize his debt to the medieval rhetorical tradition, in which the *De topicis differentiis* played an important role.⁷⁷ This eleventh-century diagram demonstrates anew the significance of the *De topicis differentiis* as a source for introductory divisions to the art of rhetoric. It also provides evidence for the use of the text for that purpose significantly prior to its employment by the glossators on the *artes* in the second half of the twelfth century.⁷⁸

Conclusion

This chapter sheds some light on the presence of diagrams in copies of the *De inventione*. In three cases enumerated above (VLQ 33, Montpellier, BIU, H 335, and Prague, NK, III.E.30) a diagram containing the divisions of philosophy or knowledge was appended to the text. As well as serving a suppletive function (by extending the observations on the derivation of wisdom and eloquence made in its opening passages), the inclusion of such diagrams points to a general interest in forms of classificatory divisions in this period. Furthermore, although these diagrams frequently failed to

section of Isidore's *Etymologiae*. Among the later MSS, the dominant trend is to present it as a 'filler text' between the *De inv.* and *Rhet. ad Her.*

76. Hunt, 'Introduction to the "Artes"', 97.

77. Ward, 'Thierry of Chartres and Liberal Arts', 252-61.

78. On the glossators, see Hunt, 'Introduction to the "Artes"', 109.

The research upon which this article is based was carried out at Leiden University during a three-year period as a postdoctoral researcher on the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek funded project, 'Turning Over a New Leaf: Manuscript Innovation in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance'.

address explicitly the divisions of the parts of rhetoric in their systematisation, their physical presence within copies of the *De inventione*, the principal text for the study of rhetoric in this period, implicitly ties the text to its broader intellectual context.

Although these diagrams of divisions of philosophy proved useful for conceptualising the intellectual place of the *De inventione*, to understand the specifics of how the art of rhetoric was conceived in this period an alternative type of diagram needs to be examined. In the two examples (VLF 70 and BPL 28) succinct summaries of the parts of rhetoric were presented. As noted, however, these did not derive their content and construction exclusively from the *De inventione*, but depended on a cohort of explanatory texts which circulated alongside it. As well as suggesting that such diagrams function as a sort of *accessus* to the art of rhetoric (and in so doing, could circulate either alongside, or independently of the *De inventione*, as in the case of BPL 28), these diagrams demonstrate the necessity of reading the *De inventione* along with the texts which contributed to the medieval understanding of it. Therefore, the visual summaries found in these diagrams enable, in turn, the metaphoric visualisation of the intellectual landscape of rhetorical study in the Middle Ages.

Bibliography

- Barker-Benfield, B.C., 'A Ninth-Century Manuscript from Fleury: *Cato de senectute cum Macrobio*', in J.J. Alexander and M.T. Gibson, eds., *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays presented to R. W. Hunt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 145-65
- , 'Review of K.A. de Meyier Codices Vossiani Latini', *The Classical Review* 27 (1977): 252-3

- Bejczy, I., *The Cardinal Virtues in the Middle Ages: A Study in Moral Thought from the Fourth to the Fourteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2011)
- Bischoff, B., 'Eine verschollene Einteilung der Wissenschaften', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 25 (1958): 5-20
- Boethius, *De topicis differentiis*, trans. with notes and essays on the text by E. Stump (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978)
- Camargo, M., 'Rhetoric', in D. Wagner, ed., *The Seven Liberal Arts in the Middle Ages* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), 96-124
- Carruthers, M., *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Cultures*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Cassian, *Conlationes*, ed. E. Pichery, *Sources Chrétiennes*, Vols. 42, 52, and 64 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1955, 1958, 1959)
- Cassiodorus, *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937)
- Cicero, *De inventione, De optime genere oratorum, Topica*, ed. and trans. H.M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library 386 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949)
- Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi: II Auctores Galliae*, ed. M.H. Jullien et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999)
- Copeland, R., and Sluiter, I., eds., *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300-1475* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- , *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Cox, V., and J.O. Ward, eds., *The Rhetoric of Cicero in its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2011)
- Derolez, R., 'Dubthach's Cryptogram. Some Notes in Connexion with Brussels MS. 9565-9566', *L'Antiquité Classique* 21 (1952): 359-75
- Esmeijer, A.C., *Divina Quaternitas: A Preliminary Study in the Method and Application of Visual Exegesis* (Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1978)
- Evans, M., 'The *Ysagoge in Theologiam* and the Commentaries Attributed

- to Bernard Silvestris', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 54 (1991): 1-42
- Franklin-Brown, M., *Reading the World: Encyclopedic Writing in the Scholastic Age* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2012)
- Fredborg, K.M., 'Twelfth Century Ciceronian Rhetoric: Its Doctrinal Development and Influences', in B. Vickers, ed., *Rhetoric Revalued: Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric* (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1982), 87-97
- Gibson, M., 'The Artes in the Eleventh Century', *Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen âge: Actes du IV^e congrès international de philosophie médiévale, Montreal 1967* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1969), 121-6
- Grabmann, M., *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* vol. 2, *Die scholastische Methode im 12. und beginnenden 13. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1911)
- Grillius, *Commentum in Ciceronis rhetorica*, ed. R. Jakobi, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana* (Munich: De Gruyter, 2002)
- Grotons, A., *Reading in Medieval St Gall* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Gumbert, P., *IIMM. Illustrated Inventory of Medieval Manuscripts 2: Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit. Lipsiani* (Leiden: Vakgroep Paleografie der Faculteit der Letteren, 1985)
- , 'Cicero Leidenses', in C.A. Chavannes-Mazel and M.M. Smith, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use* (Los Altos: Anderson-Lovelace, The Red Gull Press, 1996), 208-44
- Hellsig, R., *Die lateinischen und deutschen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig. Band 1. Die theologischen Handschriften. Teil 1 (Ms 1 - 500)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995)
- Hicks, A., 'Martianus Capella and the Liberal Arts', in R. Hexter and D. Townsend, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 307-34

- Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon*, trans. J. Taylor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St Victor*, Records of Civilisation, Sources and Studies (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961)
- Hunt, R.W., 'The Introduction to the "Artes" in the Twelfth Century', *Studia Mediaevalia in honorem admodum Reverendi Patris Raymundi Josephi Martin* (Bruges: De Tempel, 1948), 85-112
- Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M Lindsay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911)
- Irvine, M., *The Making of Textual Culture: 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory 350-1000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Iwakuma, Y., 'The Division of Philosophy and the Place of the Trivium from the 9th to mid-12th Centuries', in S. Ebbesen, ed., *Medieval Analyses in Language and Cognition* (Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1999), 165-89
- Kempshall, M., 'The Virtues of Rhetoric – Alcuin's *Disputatio de Rhetorica et de Virtutibus*', *Anglo Saxon England* 37 (2008): 7-30
- Ker, N.R., and A. Piper, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, Vol. 4: Paisley – York* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)
- Knappe, G., *Traditionen der klassische Rhetorik in angelsächsischen England* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1996)
- , 'Classical Rhetoric in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998): 5-29
- Matter, E.A., *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990)
- McKitterick, R., 'The Knowledge of Plato's *Timaeus* in the Ninth Century: The Implications of Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 293', in H.J. Westra, ed., *From Athens to Chartres: Neoplatonism and Medieval Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 85-96
- Meirinhos, J.F., 'Dessiner le savoir. Un schéma des sciences du XII^e siècle dans un manuscrit de Santa Cruz de Coimbra', in J.F. Meirinhos, ed., *Itinéraires de la raison. Études de philosophie médiévale offertes à Maria Cândida Pacheco* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Brepols, 2005), 187-204

- Minnis, A.J., *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd edn. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988)
- Molhuysen, P.C., *Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis. Codices manuscripti III: Codices Bibliothecae Publicae Latini* (Leiden: Brill, 1912)
- Mostert, M., *The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1987)
- , *The Library of Fleury: A Provisional List of Manuscripts* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1989)
- Munk Olsen, B., 'The Cistercians and Classical Culture', *Cahiers de l'institut du moyen-âge grec et latin* 47 (1984): 64-102; repr. in B. Munk Olsen, *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen-âge (IX-XII^e siècle)*, ed. K. Friis-Jensen (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1995), 95-132
- , *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, Vols. I, IV.1 (Paris: CNRS éditions, 1982, 2009)
- Newhauser, R., 'Vices as Anthropology', in C. Flüeler and M. Rohde, eds., *Laster im Mittelalter/Vices in the Middle Ages*, *Scrinium Friburgense* 23 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 105-24
- Pellegrin, E., 'Membra Disiecta Floriacensia', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 117 (1959): 5-56
- , 'La tradition des textes classiques latins à l'abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 14-15 (1984-85): 155-67
- Patrologia cursus completus, series latina* (abbreviated as *PL*), ed. J.P. Migne (Paris: Migne etc., 1884-65), available online as *Patrologia Latina: The Full Text Database* (Chadwyck Healy)
- Quain, E.A., 'The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores', *Traditio* 3 (1945): 215-264
- Richer of Rheims, *Historiae*, ed. H. Hoffinan, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica SS* 38 (Hannover, 2000)
- Saenger, P., *The Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997)

- Sears, E., 'Portraits in Counterpoint: Jerome and Jeremiah in an Augsburg Manuscript', in E. Sears and T.K. Thomas, eds., *Reading Medieval Images: The Art Historian and the Object* (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2002), 61-74
- Tarrant, R., 'Ancient Receptions of Horace', in S.J. Harrison, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 277-90
- Victorinus, *Explanatum in Rhetoricam M. Tullii Ciceronis*, in C. Halm, ed., *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1863), 153-304
- Ward, J.O., *Ciceronian Rhetoric in Treatise, Scholion and Commentary* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995)
- , 'The Date of the Commentary on Cicero's "De inventione" by Thierry of Chartres (ca. 1095-1160?) and the Cornifician Attack on the Liberal Arts', *Viator* 3 (1972): 219-74
- , 'The Medieval and Early Renaissance Study of Cicero's *De Inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: Commentaries and Contexts', in J.O. Ward and V. Cox, eds., *The Rhetoric of Cicero in its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 3-75
- Weijers, O., 'L'Appellation des disciplines dans les classifications de sciences aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles', *Archivum Latinus Mediae Aevi* 46/7 (1988): 39-64
- Weisheipl, J.A., 'Classification of the Sciences in Medieval Thought', *Mediaeval Studies* 27 (1965): 54-90
- , 'The Nature, Scope, and Classification of the Sciences', in D.C. Lindberg, ed., *Science in the Middle Ages* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 461-81
- Wirth, K.-A., 'Von mittelalterlichen Bildern und Lehrfiguren im Dienste der Schule und des Unterrichts', in B. Möller, H. Patze, and K. Stackmann, eds., *Studien zum städtischen Bildungswesen des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse 3d ser., no. 137 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 371-97

st cruciatio. Repens. i. subita. plaudir. i.
sequax. Uetomao. i. piume ispaniae, N
ibisunt. rosulenta. ME TRUM
3. XXI.
castate.

Comenti. i. cogita
ert. i. responder. cauea. i. circum
uit. Expedire. i. soluer. Nexus. i.
excitat. i. erigitur

NIUM. XXII
ionib; i. potestatibus
i. distac

Classics on Scraps: Classical Manuscripts Made from Parchment Waste

Erik Kwakkel

A striking feature of classical manuscripts from the medieval period is the broad range of their physical traits. As with other manuscript traditions, classical books are made from different writing support materials, their contents are presented in a range of layouts, and their dimensions vary from small books the size of a deck of cards, to some of the largest manuscripts produced in medieval times. However, surveying a selection of classical manuscripts from the eleventh and twelfth centuries reveals a phenomenon by which these books may well stand out from many other manuscript traditions: the notably high number of lower-grade copies. That is to say, a relatively large number of classical texts from these centuries have been copied in a lower-grade script and on medium to poor quality parchment. Moreover, such low-quality books are more likely to lack any decoration, apart perhaps from some plain penwork flourishing executed by the scribe himself.¹ High-quality classical manuscripts were made over the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, of course, but the distinct impression one gets is that the low-quality ones are far more common, perhaps even the norm.²

This essay is concerned with a classical manuscript of particularly low quality: VLO 92. It is a composite volume

I wish to thank Rodney Thomson for reading and commenting upon an earlier version of this essay.

1. See in this respect, Munk Olsen, 'The Production of the Classics', 16, ('these books [rarely] attain the high level of decorative attention given to Bibles and patristic texts').

2. This impression reflects my own experience as well as the results of two studies I supervised: an internship devoted to manuscripts from 1075-1225 in the Leiden, Biblioteca Publica Latina (BPL), which included twenty-eight classical books (Marjolein de Vos, 2012-13); and an MA thesis devoted to twenty-five classical manuscripts from 1050-1250, which included an assessment of the parch-

ment quality (Laura Luchtenburg, 2014). Also compare the online facsimiles of eleventh- and twelfth-century classical manuscripts presented in *E-codices*, available online at <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch>, accessed 4 July, 2014, which are nearly all low-quality in the way described here.

3. Contents and description in De Meyier, *Codices Vossiani Latini, Pars III*, 171-7 (dating of third booklet my own, see below). The second booklet is described in more detail in Beccaria, *I Codici di Medicina del periodo presalernitano*, nr. 115, at 338-9.

4. For Prudentius and his oeuvre, see Thomson, trans., *Prudentius* (Loeb Classical Library); Conte, *Latin Literature*, 664-7; Browning, 'Poetry', 30-2; and McGill, 'Latin Poetry', 347-8.

5. See Conte, *Latin Literature*, 694 (Rufinus), and 642-3 (Marius Victorinus). Also in the booklet is Isidore, d. 636 (*Sententiae*, fols. 12v line 5-125v line 16). Some regard him as classical as well, see Reynolds, 'Preface', xiii; and Conte, *Latin Literature*, 720-2.

of modest proportions (145x135 mm) consisting of three booklets made in the tenth and eleventh centuries, likely in France.³ All three contain classical works from either pagan or Christian authors. The first booklet contains a commentary on Priscian's *Carmina christiana* copied in the tenth century (fols. 1-32). The second booklet (fols. 33-121), copied c. 900-25, comprises four medical tracts, the largest of which is Pliny's *Medicinae* (fols. 33r-78v). The third booklet (fols. 122-55), which will be the focus of this essay, was copied in the early eleventh century. The main classical work found here is a commentary on the oeuvre of the late-antique Latin Christian poet Prudentius (the 'Christian Horace'), including on his *Cathemerinon*, *Peristephanon*, and *Psychomachia* (fols. 126r-149v line 15).⁴ In addition, the booklet contains excerpts from at least two other authors commonly regarded as classical: Rufinus of Aquileia, d. 411 (*Historia ecclesiastica*, fols. 123v line 11-124r) and Marius Victorinus, d. after 362 (*Candidi Arriani ad Marium Victorinum rhetorem de generatione divina*, fols. 124r line 5-124v line 5).⁵

While the three booklets are presently contained in an eighteenth-century bookbinding, it is not known when they were originally bound together, or even if they were together during the medieval period. Given that the three parts were produced at different times, however, we may assume that each booklet was used as a separate entity before ending up in the present composite volume. For the third part this is visible from the wear-and-tear on its first and last pages (fols. 122r and 155v), which also shows the booklet was used for some time without a binding or cover. The dark and stained surface of the parchment is, after all, typically produced by frequent movement across a desk, and thus points to an independent use prior to its current binding. The three parts

were probably united because of the similarity of their page dimensions.

As stated, the main focus of this essay is the third booklet, which represents the far end of the spectrum, an extreme, as far as quality and care of production are concerned: its leaves were not just constructed from parchment sheets of lower quality, but from the waste material that was left over during the cutting of the sheets. The present study will first demonstrate that waste parchment was used, after which the discussion will be broadened, showing that the Leiden booklet is not an isolated case but a distinguishable type of classical manuscript. Before we turn to the unusual writing support, however, the script of the main scribe will be examined, in part because this palaeographical analysis helps to explain why leftover parchment was used.

Script

According to De Meyier's manuscript description, the third booklet of VLO 92 was perhaps produced in France. While the script is very difficult to localise, French origins are conceivable, if only because distinct German, English, and Italian traits are largely missing. There may be possible evidence of English origins, given that the main scribe is an early adopter of Gothic feet at minims, as discussed shortly. However, all considering, the evidence is not enough to place the manuscript's origins in England.⁶ The miscellany was copied by two hands. The first, Scribe A, wrote from the very beginning of the booklet, at fol. 122r, up to fol. 152r, near the end of line 1. His duct is highly variable, to the extent that at times one is inclined to attribute parts of his stint to other individuals (such as, for example, the section starting at line 19 on fol. 133v, and the segment on fol. 149r-v, line 15). In his

6. I wish to thank Teresa Webber and Peter Stokes for a discussion that helped me form this opinion about the booklet's origins.

7. De Meyier, *Codices Vossiani Latini, Pars III*, 175.

8. Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books*, 58. The chronology is my own and will be discussed in more detail in a monograph I am preparing on the birth of Gothic script.

description of the manuscript De Meyier concludes that the codex was written by a main scribe whose work is interrupted by eight stints from multiple other hands.⁷ However, it is my opinion that the booklet was largely copied by a single individual who used a highly variable duct. This is indicated most clearly by a distinctive long *s* that appears throughout Scribe A's stint (although this type is not used exclusively): the top of this *s* leans backward, it is thinner than the body, features a sharp hook, and sometimes appears composite, as if the top were added with a separate stroke. A second person, Scribe B, takes over at fol. 152r near the end of line 1, first completing that line and subsequently copying until the end of fol. 154r. The remainder of the booklet was copied by Scribe A (fols. 154v-155r).

While the booklet is commonly dated to the tenth century, placing its origins in the eleventh century would perhaps seem more appropriate. We need to look more closely at the script. The oldest 'offcut manuscript' so far identified can be dated to the middle of the twelfth century, as will be discussed shortly. Since the third booklet in VLO 92 is, in fact, older, and will take over that distinction, it is worthwhile to determine the booklet's exact moment of production. The discussion will be limited to the main hand, Scribe A, and will focus on two distinctive palaeographical features.

The first of these is 'angularity', or the flattening of round strokes, a practice first used in the limb of *h* and flag of *r*, later followed by the round top part of other letters, including *b*, *c*, *e*, and *o*.⁸ The third booklet in VLO 92 frequently shows such angularity in *b*, *p*, and *r* (though never consistent on all its pages) and occasionally in *c* and *o* (again, never consistently). Palaeographical handbooks define this feature as Gothic, relating its emergence to the development

of an early form of Gothic script called *Littera praegothica*, the roots of which tend to be placed in the late eleventh century.⁹ However, a close look at manuscripts present in the *Catalogues des manuscrits datés* (CMD) suggests that angularity, a key feature of Gothic, was very frequently used during the first half of the eleventh century as well. Among the forty manuscripts from 1000-1049 in the CMD, no less than thirty include angularity: twenty-seven of these present the feature in a mixed form (where a single manuscript presents both angular and non-angular presentations for the same letter) and an additional three do so consistently (the scribe always opts for an angular presentation).¹⁰ More importantly for our dating of the third booklet, the feature rarely appears in the tenth century. It is, at any rate, encountered in only one of the nine manuscripts from that century included in the CMD. The manuscript in question was produced, moreover, in the very late tenth century and presents a mixed use of the feature (Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 183, datable to 933-1004).¹¹

The same goes for the second early Gothic feature present in the script of Scribe A: the direction of the feet at minims. Observation, for example, of the letters **m** and **n**, which are the clearest indicators in this respect, reveals that their feet are sometimes executed in the Caroline style (meaning that the first minim, and in case of **m** also the second, turns to the left), while at other times the scribe shapes these minims in the Gothic fashion (meaning all feet turn to the right). The latter is also regarded as a feature of *Littera praegothica* and its emergence is therefore commonly tied to the late eleventh century.¹² While this feature is much more rare in the first half of the eleventh century than angularity, the CMD shows that it does occur this early: three manuscripts

9. For this script, see Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books*, 65-71. Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books* places the birth of pregothic in the late eleventh century (at 56), while Brown, *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts from Antiquity to 1600* (73) and Schneider, *Paläographie und Handschriftenkunde für Germanisten* (28) place it in the late eleventh or early twelfth century.

10. These three are Avranches, BM, 98 (Normandy, Mont-Saint-Michel, 991-1009), BnF, lat. 17275 (France, Cluny, 1022-1026), and BL, Royal 5 A.xi (Normandy, St Bertin, 1022-1041).

11. I am indebted to my research assistant, Ramona Venema (Leiden), for gathering and processing the data for the period 1000-1049 and the tenth century.

12. For this feature, see Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books*, 58-9.

13. Consistent Gothic feet: BL, Cotton Tiberius B. v, part 1, fols. 2-73 (England, Winchester?, 995-1016); BL, Royal 5 A.xi (France, St Bertin, 1022-41); and Rouen, BM, 272 (France, St Wandrille, 1033-53). Mixed Caroline-Gothic feet: CUL, Kk.5.32 (England, Exeter, 1021).

14. For some clear-cut cases, see Stokes, *English Vernacular Minuscule*, Fig. 9 at 276 (Anglo-Saxon), Plate 12 at 289 (Latin), Plates 14-15 at 291-2 (AS), Plate 20 at 297 (AS). See also Ker, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, Plate II (1000-1050, Latin and AS).

15. I wish to thank Francis Newton for looking at the script of Scribe A, and confirming my rationale for re-dating it. He too opts for a date in the early eleventh century.

among the forty from 1000-1049 exhibit consistent Gothic feet in **m** and **n**, and one other presents a mix of Caroline and Gothic.¹³ While Gothic feet are not seen among the tenth-century manuscripts in the CMD, they do occur in tenth-century manuscripts and charters made in one particular European region: England. A surprising number of items copied in English Vernacular Minuscule during the period 990-1035, for example, show consistent 'Gothic' feet in **m** and **n**, as well as in other letter forms with minims, such as **h**. This feature occurs in both Anglo-Saxon and Latin writing samples.¹⁴

All in all, a date in the tenth century appears unlikely for Scribe A, given his use of two early Gothic features. Furthermore, the script's aspect, in particular the size of the letters and their round appearance, is in tune with what we see in the eleventh century. While it is difficult to say for sure when the booklet was precisely copied, the height of the ascenders still have a tenth-century feel. The most probable date is therefore the first half of the eleventh century, perhaps even the first quarter.¹⁵

The execution of the script provides us with other valuable information, in particular some notable irregularities. First of all, the size of the script varies considerably, with larger and smaller versions of letters found on the same page, sometimes even in the same line. There are other palaeographical inconsistencies as well, such as the varying amount of white space found between the lines. An explanation is found when we look at these locations more carefully: Scribe A sometimes places the letters *on* the ruled line, while in other cases the dry point ruling appears halfway up the letter height, which produces an uneven distribution of lines on the page. The thickness of the strokes varies as well, which suggests that the

nib of the pen was not always cut in the same manner. The actual execution of individual letter shapes, moreover, varies considerably. The ascenders and descenders, for example, are of unequal length, while many letters are shaped slightly differently, even when placed close together. This is particularly notable in **a**, **g**, and long **s**. All this adds up to an important conclusion, that Scribe A probably proceeded without optimal care, and possibly at high speed. We will return to the issue of care later.

Offcuts

Having dealt with palaeographical issues, we now turn to the actual focus of this essay, the unusual kind of parchment used for the production of the third booklet of VLO 92 (fols. 122-155). At the heart of the discussion is a type of writing support that has attracted little attention in the context of medieval book production: superfluous strips of parchment that were left over when animal skins were turned into sheets.¹⁶ To claim that the booklet was made from this material, as this essay sets out to do, it is necessary to shift our attention to this waste material for a moment.

There were two ways by which sheets – bifolia – were retrieved from animal skins. In the first scenario the scribe cut rectangular sheets out of an unfolded skin, which lay flat on his desk. Depending on the type and size of the animal, a skin would generally produce one to four bifolia. The zone from which the sheets were taken can be called the ‘prime cut’ in that it represents the (central) part of the skin that provided the most optimal writing surface. The outer rim of the skin, by contrast, was deemed unsuitable, given the presence of certain defects, to be described shortly. This outer rim was thus removed, usually in several cuts. As a result, when

16. The following introduction to offcuts and their properties leans heavily on my ‘Discarded Parchment as Writing Support’, 239-41, where the matter is discussed in more detail.

17. See the discussion in my 'Discarded Parchment', 254.

18. The following section summarizes the more in-depth discussion in Kwakkel, 'Discarded Parchment', 240-1.

the person cutting the sheets had finished, he not only had a pile of rectangular sheets on his table but also a number of irregularly-shaped strips of waste parchment.

The second scenario shows the reverse: the animal skin was first folded and then trimmed. If the skin was of modest proportions, or if the planned manuscript was large, the skin was folded only once, along the long side, which created a single bifolium. The skin could also be folded once along its short side, but this seems to have been an exceptional practice. It produced, after all, a manuscript with extremely high and narrow pages that looked 'off'. The only book produced in this fashion that I know of is the late twelfth-century Bodleian, Junius 1, the 'Ormulum', which measures an astonishing *c.* 500x195 mm.¹⁷ If a skin was large enough it could be folded not just once, but perhaps up to three times, which produced an entire quire of four double sheets. After folding, the skin needed to be trimmed, for the same reason as in the first scenario: to remove the unsuitable outer rim, which was still included in the bifolium or quire. When the scribe had completed his work, his desk was littered with redundant strips of waste parchment, as in the first scenario.

Thus scraps of parchment, 'offcuts', were a by-product of making bifolia. They effectively represent the difference between the shape of the skin and that of the rectangular 'prime cut' that formed the basis for the actual sheet or sheets. While their shape and length varied considerably, all waste strips had deficiencies indicative of their peripheral position on the skin.¹⁸ The most pronounced of these deficiencies are concavities. First there are the holes that appeared as the skin was drying on a wooden frame. The skin was held in place by short ropes that were wrapped around pebbles pushed into the wet material. As the skin dried, the area around the

pebbles stretched, producing half-moon shapes between any two attachment points. Another type of concavity was more 'shallow' and located in the axilla area behind the forelegs and in front of the hind legs of the animal. Smaller gaps, lastly, appeared when the parchment maker removed the skin from the frame. To do so he had to cut away the pebbles, which were now embedded in the dried, hardened skin. When scissors were used for this, a small channel would sometimes have to be made in the skin, from the edge to the pebble; these, too, are found in offcuts.

There are other kinds of deficiencies found on the strips. The regions near the neck, rump, forelegs, and hind legs contained deposits of fat, which resulted in thick, stiff, and translucent patches when the skin was turned into parchment. In fact, in these parts of the skin the material can be so translucent that sometimes the text from the next folium is visible (Plate 11). Moreover, the surface was usually treated less rigorously than the prime cut (it is difficult to sand the skin's somewhat lumpy edge) and so it shows imperfections, often very clearly, which are not commonly found on sheets taken from the prime cut: follicle patterns, streaks from the parchment-maker's knife (the *lunellum*), and discoloration (brown or yellow 'stains'). In some places the surface is very glossy and slippery, while in other instances it can be rough. Often, the ink would not 'take' properly in these locations when written on, producing a faded text that can be difficult to read.

Considering their small size and poor appearance it is not surprising that this waste material was commonly boiled down for glue, rather than used for the production of books. Judging from the following entry in a dictionary from the 1470s, their size in particular was deemed problematic: 'Ce-

19. Hoffmann, 'Beschreibung', 277, as noted in Wattenbach, *Schriftwesen*, 124, n. 1. Hoffmann identifies the dictionary as an incunable from the 1470s, printed by Günther Zainer in Augsburg (280).

20. Kwakkel, 'Discarded Parchment', 246-55. In addition to the examples listed, there is Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 18 (*Collationes*, c. 1300), see Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, 130 (I wish to thank Rodney Thomson for drawing my attention to this specimen).

21. Kwakkel, 'Discarded Parchment', 247-8 (Welsh manuscripts) and 255 (Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 3067-73). Description of the latter in Kwakkel, *Dit zijn die Dietsche boeke die ons toebehoeren*, 227-33.

22. Description in Vattasso and Carusi, *Codices Vatican Latini: Codices 9852-10300*, 618-9 (date is my own). The photographs I used for this assessment are part of an image database set up under the direction of Monica Green (Arizona State University). The images

dula, zedel, est pars pergameni, de qua propter sui parvitatem non potest fieri liber aptus' [An off-cut, or zedel, is a bit of parchment from which no proper book can be made because it is too small].¹⁹ In spite of this verdict, however, some scribes *did* use the material to this end. In a first exploration of the phenomenon, published in 2012, I was able to identify several 'offcut manuscripts' from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.²⁰ What binds them is not just the presence of discoloration, translucent patches, and pronounced follicle patterns, but also their modest dimensions: they rarely exceed a page height of 150 mm. For example, two Welsh medical manuscripts from the fourteenth century measure only 120x90 mm and 135x100 mm (Oxford, Jesus College, 20 and Bodleian, Rawlinson B. 467, respectively), while a Middle Dutch composite manuscript whose twelve parts are all made from scraps measures 130x90 mm (Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 3067-73, see Plate 12).²¹ The oldest identified manuscript is a medical ('Articella') codex from the second quarter of the twelfth century (BAV, Vat. lat. 10281), measuring 152x103 mm. Here too, we encounter pages that frequently fall short, show discoloration and follicle patterns, and contain substantial gaps, sometimes accompanied by stretch marks.²²

The Evidence

Returning to the third booklet of VLO 92, the evidence that offcuts were used for its production is overwhelming: literally every folium shows the deficiencies that are typical of such scraps. Usually several are found on the same page. Starting with discoloration, nearly every page shows a surface colour that appears more yellow than one would expect. Many are, moreover, dark yellow or brown. There are examples of

brown patches interfering with reading the text, which appears faded in such cases (see for example fol. 125r, lower corner, and fol. 151v, central part of page). Many folia show a pronounced follicle pattern as well as horny patches, which feel hard and stiff. In some instances translucent patches are encountered. Another typical surface defect of offcuts, lastly, is seen on fols. 139v, 144v, 145v, 153r and 155r, where the ink did not take. The text is faded and the surface feels rougher on these pages.

More pronounced defects are the gaps visible on nearly every folium. They come in four categories: 1) Round concavities of limited width, measuring 20-40 mm in diameter and usually in the shape of an oval or a half circle, as seen on fols. 123, 131, 133, 136, and 147 (Plate 13); 2) Broad gaps with a roundish shape that may take up the entire width or height of the page, as present at fols. 127, 135, 141, and 152 (Plate 14); 3) Missing corners featuring a straight edge (fols. 123, 124, 128, 132, 139, 143, and 144), some of them being only 5 mm short (as in fol. 144, lower corner), others substantially more (the missing corners at fols. 150 and 151 'cut' into a third of the page's height) (Plate 15); 4) Gaps in the inner margin, in or near the gutter (fols. 124, 131, 138, 141, and 147) (Plate 16).

The first category probably represents strips that were taken from the area near the neck of the beast, or near the forelegs or hind legs. The second category of gaps results from the stretching of the skin between two attachment points (locations where the skin was tied to the drying frame). Strips taken from these zones typically show long and elongated gaps, as discussed. The third category – missing corners – are the result of the scribe cutting away the narrow holes of the first category. This practice could have

in question were submitted to the database by Tess Tavormina (Michigan State University). I wish to thank both scholars for allowing me to use their photographic material.

23. The only text loss is found at fol. 155, where a strip of parchment 35 mm in width was cut vertically along the long side of the page. This was done post-production.

an aesthetic motivation (it looked more ‘finished’), or perhaps it had a more pragmatic purpose, given that it may have been easier to turn a page when the missing corner had a straight edge. The fourth category has two explanations. In the first, the strip that was used for the bifolium contained a large hole (as in fols. 138/141 – here and below, a slash indicates a bifolium). In the second explanation the edge of the used offcut sloped significantly, with the result that the middle of the strip was not as high as the manuscript, causing a gap to appear in the fold. Scribes usually lined up the strip in such a way that this gap appeared at the lower edge of the manuscript (see Plate 16).

As a result of the inclusion of gaps, a folium may turn out to be short in its height or width. In fact, only six folia in the entire booklet are regular in that they form a perfect rectangular shape representing the required dimensions of 143x135 mm: fols. 125 and 130 (which form the fourth bifolium in quire 1); fols. 134 and 154 (forming the first bifolium in quire 2); and fols. 137 and 142 (the fourth bifolium in quire 3). Notably, all remaining folia of the booklet fall short on one or both sides. There are no signs of text loss, suggesting that these imperfect folia were designed this way by the scribe.²³ The second category in particular – elongated gaps running along a substantial part of the page’s short or long side – caused significant loss of surface space. These elongated holes often run along the entire width of the page, giving its lower edge a slightly sloping appearance. It also happens that a page is shorter in height or width than the others, even though the edge is perfectly straight. For example, the fifth bifolium of quire 1 (fols. 126/129) is only 82–95 mm high, so roughly 40 mm shorter in height than the other leaves; the individual folia are 100 mm wide, making

their width 35 mm shorter than the others. However, the bifolium in question has straight edges, suggesting that its incompleteness was not caused by concavities. Other leaves of this kind are fols. 139/140 (a bifolium), 148/153 (a bifolium), fol. 149 (a singleton) and fol. 154 (a singleton).

The probable explanation for these cases is that the offcut chosen for the job was not big enough to form a complete bifolium. They show that the scribe did not mind using waste material that was substantially smaller than the dimensions he had decided to give to the manuscript. In this respect the presence of the singletons makes perfect sense as well. This compromise allowed the scribe to include small strips that were unsuitable for the production of actual bifolia (Plate 17). Indeed, the two singletons mentioned above (149 and 154) measure only 143x110 and 143x105 mm, smaller than a deck of cards. There are other singletons found in the manuscript. Observing the quire structure of the codex reveals that three bifolia are actually composite, meaning they consist of two singletons folded together to form a single bifolium.²⁴

The practice of combining two offcuts into one bifolium is seen in other offcut manuscripts as well, such as the first of the Brussels booklets mentioned above (Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, 3067-73). Another way to combine two smaller strips was to use a second offcut to fill up a large concavity in the first, or to glue two offcuts together to extend the size of the bifolium and thus the size of the book. Both practices are encountered in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 733B (Langland, *Piers Plowman*, 1400-1425).²⁵ Scribe A of our VLO 92 booklet did not make it easy for himself when he included multiple composite bifolia. It was only in the binding stage, when the stitches

24. The collation formula for the manuscript is 1^{vi} [fols. 124/131 composite bifolium] (133), 2^{vi} (145), 3^{vi} [fols. 147/154 and 149/152 composite bifolium] (155).

25. Kwakkel, 'Discarded Parchment', 252-3.

26. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux X^e et XI^e siècles: Tome IV*, 157.

27. The Munich booklets below can be consulted online at <http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de>, accessed 7 July, 2014, the URLs of the other specimens are provided. Nr. 2 is the only one I studied *in situ*. My research assistant, Ramona Venema, traced the manuscripts with a height below 150 mm.

28. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins: Tome I*, 168. Online facsimile at <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/bke/0154>, accessed 7 July, 2014.

went through their folded gutters, that two singletons became securely attached. Until then the scribe would have to look after the pairs at all times, making sure they would stay together while other folia were shuffled around on his desk.

Classics on Scraps

The Leiden booklet adds to our understanding of the classical manuscript tradition, to which a book made from offcuts is identified for the first time. While lower-quality books appear common in the manuscript tradition of the classics, the Leiden scrap booklet takes a special position, at the bottom end of the scale. Moreover, it is by no means an isolated case. Among the smallest surviving classical manuscripts from the eleventh and twelfth centuries other specimens are hiding. In the fourth volume of his *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux X^e et XI^e siècles*, Munk Olsen notes that a considerable number of classical manuscripts have a page height of 150 mm or less: five survive from the tenth century, seven from the eleventh century and thirty-seven from the twelfth century.²⁶ While he does not provide their shelfmarks, these small classical books may be identified from the manuscript descriptions found in two other volumes of his publication. With the help of online facsimiles several offcut manuscripts with classical contents may be identified in addition to the Leiden booklet:²⁷

1. Engelberg, SB, 154 (Cicero, *De inventione*, Engelberg, 1143-1178, 125 fols., 121x95 mm).²⁸ Features: surface deficiencies are rare except for the occasional horny patch (e.g. at pp. 19, 27, and 48); gaps of category 1 (e.g. pp. 34/35, 48/49), category 2 (e.g. pronounced at pp. 73/74, more subtle on many other folia) and category 3 (e.g. pp. 22/23,

35/36, and 40/41), although usually not very significant; rectangular sheet that is significantly short (pp. 70/71); high volume of singletons that form composite bifolia, as shown by the presence of stubs (e.g. before pp. 11, 14, 31, 47, and 50). The scribe probably opted for a codex with such limited dimensions because it allowed him to avoid including significant gaps (the ones present do not run very deep) and to pick scraps with a relatively good quality surface.

2. BPL 1925, booklet 6, fols. 111-20 (excerpts from Gellius, France?, 1150-1200, 10 fols., 118x96 mm).²⁹ Features: discoloration and staining on all folia, substantial translucency (fols. 111 and 120, see Plate 11); gaps of category 3 (fol. 119) and category 4 (fols. 112 and 117); some singletons present.

3. BSB, Clm. 14100, booklet 1, fols. 1-49 (Horace, *Opera*, Italy, 1150-1200, 49 fols., 165x105 mm).³⁰ Features: nearly all folia have a poor surface that includes horny patches, discoloration and pronounced follicle patterns; substantial gaps of category 1 (fols. 1, 2, 4, 48), category 2 (fols. 12, 13, 14, and many other folia in this booklet), and category 3 (fol. 3).

4. BSB, Clm. 14809, booklet 1, fols. 1-17 (Virgil, *Bucolica*, Italy, 1150-1200, 17 fols., 144x75-100 mm).³¹ Features: many leaves with discoloration, pronounced follicle pattern and horny patches; gaps of category 1 (e.g. fols. 5 and 6), category 2 (fols. 2, 17b, and many others); rectangular folium that is short (fol. 13); patching of gap with a second offcut (fol. 15); pebble-removal channel (fol. 17a). The gaps do not run as deep as in other offcut manuscripts, but this probably results from trimming during binding (note that the pricking is mostly cut).

29. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins: Tome II*, 197 and Gumbert, *Illustrated Inventory of Illuminated Manuscripts*, nr. 1515, at 114.

30. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins: Tome I*, 468.

31. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins: Tome II*, 740.

32. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins: Tome I*, 470.

33. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins: Tome II*, 149.

34. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins: Tome I*, 470.

5. BSB, Clm. 14809, booklet 2, fols. 18-47 (Horace, *Carmina* and *De arte poetica epistula ad Pisonem*, Germany, 1150-1200, 30 fols., 144x100 mm).³² Features: substantial number of pages with discoloration, translucency, and horny bits; many pages with significant gaps of category 1 (fols. 27, 29, and 31), category 2 (e.g. fols. 20, 21, 33, 34, and many more) and 3 (fol. 19); rectangular sheets that are short (e.g. fols. 20, 36, and 37); folia from which the gaps have been cut (e.g. fol. 40).

6. BSB, Clm. 14809, booklet 3, fols. 48-64 (Ovid, *De remedio amoris cum glossis*, Germany, 1150-1200, 17 fols., 144x100 mm).³³ Features: many leaves with discoloration, horny patches, and with ink that does not take well; gaps of category 1 (fol. 53), category 2 (fols. 49, 56, 57, 61, and many others); rectangular folium that is short (fol. 56).

7. BSB, Clm. 14809, booklet 6, fols. 91-99 (Horace, *Ars poetriae*, Germany, 1150-1200, 9 fols., 140x90 mm).³⁴ Features: substantial number of pages with discoloration and where ink does not take well; gaps of category 2 (fols. 92 and 93) and category 4 (fol. 91); rectangular sheets that are short (fols. 98 and 99).

While these additional specimens form a modest sample, they do suggest that the offcut manuscript is a category of its own in the transmission of classical literature during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. A preliminary study of their physical features, moreover, points out striking parallels with the Leiden booklet. These go beyond the dimensions of the page and the presence of gaps and surface deficiencies, which merely result from the fact that scraps were used. Other parallels, for example, are the lack of decoration, the low qual-

ity of the script, the significant duct variation shown by the scribes, and the somewhat sloppy execution of the *mise en page*, as shown by a lack of justification on the right side of the text block. In other words, as in the Leiden booklet, a certain lack of care unites the seven items listed above. Moreover, with the exception of Engelberg, SB, 154, which is a full manuscript with 125 folia, the additional offcut manuscripts are all booklets of modest thickness, containing only nine, ten, seventeen, thirty, and forty-nine folia. It appears that when a full classical manuscript was planned, scribes tended to use regular sheets from the prime cut, while with booklets, scribes sometimes resorted to scrap material. The probable explanation for this phenomenon may be one of availability: there may simply not have been enough scraps lying around to make a full manuscript.

The eight offcut manuscripts presented in this essay prompt an important question: why copy classics on scraps, especially considering how much they affected a book's appearance? The most probable answer is that it provided scribes a means to economise. Itemised bills of manuscripts produced commercially suggest that up to twenty per cent of the total cost was taken up by the writing support (this goes for parchment books), so financial savings could be made by replacing regular parchment sheets with scraps.³⁵ After all, such leftover material must have been very cheap when purchased. Such is suggested not only by their material properties, but also by medieval primary sources, such as the thirteenth-century statement that Thomas Aquinas' use of offcuts for the production of his *Summa contra gentiles* reflected his love of poverty.³⁶ Moreover, if a scribe had purchased full skins (i.e. uncut sheets) from the stationer or parchment maker rather than prefabricated sheets or quires, the scraps

35. See, for example, the evidence in Kwakkel, 'Commercial Organisation', 183.

36. As discussed in Kwakkel, 'Discarded Parchment', 245.

37. Burnett, 'Give him the White Cow', 15. See my 'Discarded Parchment', 243-4, for a broader assessment of scraps and note-taking.

38. When I discovered this note in 2013, it was glued against the inside of the board at the back. It has since been removed and is presently stored separately in the manuscript.

39. Kwakkel, 'Discarded Parchment', 242-3 (letters) and 245-6 (drafts).

40. Gorman, 'Claudius of Turin', 316.

were available at no cost, since they were a by-product of the regular sheets produced for other projects.

The urge to economise may not be the full explanation. Inspecting the broader use of offcuts in medieval written culture – that is, beyond the production of manuscripts – reveals another binding feature: they were mostly meant for personal use. While manuscripts in the eleventh and twelfth century were commonly made for institutional use, scrap material had a limited circulation, usually confined to the maker himself. A good example of this is the use of scraps for note-taking, which appears to be one of the most popular applications of the material. *De discipline scholarum*, a Paris guidebook for students and teachers made in the 1230s, suggests that the strips (*cedulae*) were brought to the classroom for taking notes.³⁷ Scholars also used scraps when studying texts, excerpting from them, or summarising their contents, as seen on a thirteenth-century slip that recently emerged in BPL 191 D (Plate 18).³⁸ Not only did the low cost of the material make offcuts supremely suitable for taking notes, so did the nature of the writing itself. Notes were, after all, meant for personal use, and so there was simply no need to use good parchment.

The same sentiment is encountered with two other popular genres for which scraps were used: drafts and letters.³⁹ The practice of using scraps for draft texts dates back to at least the ninth century. In his commentary on Genesis, Claudius of Turin (d. 827) apologizes for the potential mistakes that were included. The mistakes result, he explains, from the fact that he copied excerpts straight from his sources into his own text rather than first 'arrang[ing] them on pieces of parchment' (*schedulae*).⁴⁰ The example shows that Claudius would normally use offcuts as a vehicle for a draft

text, much as Aquinas did in the thirteenth century. Similarly, Peter Damian (d. 1072 or 1073) had a monk write out his dictated draft letters on a parchment scrap for his approval, after which a final copy was produced and ultimately sent out.⁴¹ These examples, too, show how the poor and potentially off-putting appearance of scraps mattered little, since the objects produced from them were not likely to reach a broad audience. That is to say, while letters were explicitly meant for a readership beyond the sender, its circulation in the original form, as a scrap, was limited. Letters that reached a broader audience usually did so in the form of collections of copied out letters, presented in regular parchment manuscripts.⁴²

While the low cost of scraps was probably an important rationale for using them, another key motivation in the copying of classical texts on scraps may potentially be the personal nature of the manuscript's intended use: the object is more likely to have been made for personal consultation by the individuals who produced them than for wide circulation within a community or institution. A strong supporting argument for this is the lack of care that the scribes of the eight manuscripts exhibited during the copying stage, as witnessed in the variable duct, and the lack of proper justification of the text block. Moreover, considering that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries education was the foremost purpose for producing classical manuscripts,⁴³ we may well understand the tiny objects as manuals, *aides mémoire*, used by teachers: the thin and light booklet, made casually and with little financial investment, would have made an ideal hand-held aid in the oral delivery of lectures.

41. Blum, *The Letters of Peter Damian* 1-30, 15-6.

42. For the short lifespan of the original letter, see Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections*, 18-20.

43. See, for example, Scaglione, 'The Classics in Medieval Education'; Munk Olsen, 'The Production of Classics'; Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God*, 113-6; Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, 19-26; and Reynolds, "Let him read the Satires of Horace".

Bibliography

- Bauer-Eberhardt, U., *Die illuminierten Handschriften italienischer Herkunft in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek. Teil 1: Vom 10. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Katalog der illuminierten Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München 6 (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2011)
- Beccaria, A., *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano (secoli IX, X, et XI)* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1956)
- Bischoff, B., *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abenländischen Mittelalters*, 2nd edn., Grundlagen der Germanistik 24 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1986)
- Blum, O.J., trans., *The Letters of Peter Damian 1-30*, The Fathers of the Church, Mediaeval Continuation (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1989)
- Brown, M., *A Guide to Western Historical Scripts from Antiquity to 1600* (London: British Library, 2002)
- Browning, R., 'Poetry', in E.J. Kenney, ed., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature Volume II, Part 5: The Later Principate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 10-46
- Burnett, C., 'Give him the White Cow: Notes and Note-Taking in the Universities in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *History of Universities* 14 (1998): 1-30
- Constable, G., *Letters and Letter-Collections*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), 18-20
- Conte, G.B., *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. J.B. Solodow, revised by D. Fowler and G.W. Most (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999)
- De Meyier, K.A., *Codices Vossiani Latini, Pars III: Codices in Octavo* (Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1977)
- Derolez, A., *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books from the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century*, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

- Evans, G.R., *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980)
- Gorman, M., 'The Commentary on Genesis of Claudius of Turin and Biblical Studies under Louis the Pious', *Speculum* 72 (1997): 279-329
- Gumbert, P., *IIMM. Illustrated Inventory of Medieval Manuscripts 2: Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit. Lipsiani* (Leiden: Vakgroep Paleografie der Faculteit der Letteren, 1985)
- Hoffmann, F.L., 'Beschreibung eines der ältesten und sehr seltenen lateinisch-deutschen etymologischen Sachwörterbuches', *Serapeum: Zeitschrift für Bibliothekwissenschaft, Handschriftenkunde und ältere Litteratur* 18 (1862): 273-81
- Ker, N.R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957)
- Kwakkel, E., *Dit zijn die Dietsche boeke die ons toebehoeren: De kartuizers van Herne en de productie van Middelnederlandse handschriften in de regio Brussel (1350-1400)*, *Miscellanea Neerlandica* 27 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002)
- , 'Commercial Organisation and Economic Innovation', in A. Gillespie and D. Wakelin, eds., *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1530*, *Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology* 14 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 173-91
- , 'Discarded Parchment as Writing Support in English Manuscript Culture', in A.S.G. Edwards and O. Da Rold, eds., *English Manuscripts Before 1400*, *English Manuscript Studies, 1100-1700* 17 (London: The British Library, 2012), 238-61
- Leclercq, J., *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2009)
- McGill, S., 'Latin Poetry', in S.F. Johnson, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 335-60
- Munk Olsen, B., *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles. Tome I: Catalogue des manuscrits classiques latins copiés du IX^e au XII^e*

- siècle: Apicius-Juvénal* (Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1982)
- , *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles. Tome II: Catalogue des manuscrits classiques latins copiés du IX^e au XII^e siècle: Livius-Vitruvius: florilèges, essais de plume* (Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1985)
- , *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles. Tome IV, 2^e Partie: La réception de la littérature classique manuscrits et texts* (Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 2014)
- , 'The Production of the Classics in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in C.A. Chavannes-Mazel and M.M. Smith, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use* (Los Altos Hills: Anderson-Lovelace, 1996), 1-18
- Reynolds, L.D., 'Preface', in C.A. Chavannes-Mazel and M.M. Smith, eds., *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use* (Los Altos Hills: Anderson-Lovelace, 1996), xiii-xvi
- Reynolds, S., "'Let him read the Satires of Horace": Reading, Literacy and Grammar in the Twelfth Century', in J. Raven et al., eds., *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 22-40
- Scaglione, A., 'The Classics in Medieval Education', in A.S. Bernardo and S. Levin, eds., *The Classics in the Middle Ages* (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1990), 343-62
- Schneider, K., *Paläographie und Handschriftenkunde für Germanisten: Eine Einführung*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekten 8 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1999)
- Stokes, P., *English Vernacular Minuscule from Aethelred to Cnut, c. 990-c. 1035* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, and Rochester: Boydell and Brewer, 2014)
- Thomson, H.J., trans., *Prudentius*, Loeb Classical Library 398 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953)
- Thomson, R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in*

Worcester Cathedral Library, with a contribution on the bindings by M. Gullick (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer on behalf of the Dean and Chapter of Worcester, 2001)

Vattasso, M., and H. Carusi, eds., *Codices Vaticani Latini: Codices 9852-10300* (Rome: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1914)

Wattenbach, W., *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1871)

Wunderle, E., *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München: Die Handschriften aus St. Emmeram in Regensburg: Bd. 1. Clm 14000-14130* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995)

Living with Ovid: The Founding of Arnulf of Orléans' Thebes

David T. Gura

In the late twelfth century Arnulf of Orléans (c. 1175), schoolmaster at the cathedral school of St Euverte, produced a composite commentary to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, which influenced the reception, grammatical and allegorical interpretation, and commentary tradition of the work through the fifteenth century.¹ In particular, Arnulf's unique combination of meticulous philological rigor and assertive allegorical exposition (at times even self-referential) allows a view into a classroom in which an authoritative master recontextualizes the *Metamorphoses* for his students and reconciles its meaning within the milieu of the late twelfth century. This essay will contextualize the nature and influence of Arnulf's *Metamorphoses* commentary, analyze the formats of the extant manuscript evidence, then illustrate the significant blend of grammatical and allegorical approaches through a close reading of Arnulf's commentary to Ovid's founding of Thebes, a well known episode which serves as an illustrative epitome of the commentator's innovative exposition of the *Metamorphoses*.

Arnulf of Orléans and the *Orléanais*

Arnulf, also known as Rufus Arnulfus, was one of the known authoritative masters of the *Orléanais* active in the late

1. A complete critical edition is in progress currently from my unpublished dissertation, Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study of Arnulf of Orléans' Philological Commentary'; the seminal article discovering Arnulf and his works is Ghisalberti, 'Arnolfo d'Orléans', which edits some of the material and remains the only edition of the *Allegoriae*. Though commendable, Ghisalberti's text is prone to many errors in transcription and does not represent the textual tradition accurately since many important manuscripts and their relationships were unknown to him; Coulson, 'Reading the Classics in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', 29-30 addresses the problems of Ghisalberti's text; see also Coulson and Nawotka, 'The

Re-Discovery of Arnulf of Orléans' Glosses to Ovid's Creation Myth', 267-99; and Coulson's many publications in this bibliography.

2. Engelbrecht, ed., *De Bursarii Super Ovidios van Magister Willem van Orleans*; Shooner, 'Les Bursarii Ovidianorum de Guillaume d'Orléans', 405-24.

3. Engelbrecht, 'Carmina Pieridum', 210-26 and 'Fulco, Arnulf, and William', 52-73 discusses the three commentators in detail; overviews of Arnulf and William are found in Coulson, 'Metamorphoses in the School Tradition of France', 50-8.

4. Contemporary attestations include Alexander Neckham (*De laudibus diuinae sapientiae*, 5.607-10) and Geoffrey of Vinsauf (*Poetria Nova*, 1013-17); generally, see Englebrecht's articles in n. 3; Ziolkowski, 'Mastering Authors and Authorizing Masters', 112-3 for Orléans specifically; Coulson, 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the School Tradition of France, 1180-1400', 48-50; Coulson, 'Ovid's Transformations in Medieval France', 33-5.

twelfth century. Along with Fulco of Orléans, his slightly elder contemporary and rival, he continues the tradition of Hilary of Orléans, the magister credited with establishing the exposition of the *auctores* in Orléans. A third master who authored the *Versus Bursarii*,² William of Orléans (c. 1200), follows closely in the manner of his predecessors.³ The Loire region and particularly Orléans had a strong reputation for the reception and exposition of the classical *auctores*.⁴ In addition to commentators, schools, and students, Orléans was also an active center of textual transmission. Of particular significance are the *florilegia* known to have originated and circulated there in the twelfth century (along with source material): the *Florilegium Gallicum* and *Florilegium Angelicum*.⁵ These *florilegia* enabled a rich access to diverse selections of texts, *sententiae*, and classical authors.⁶

This access to texts, source materials, schools, and Magister Hilary's tradition of exposition no doubt fostered the robust output of the *Orléanais* commentators. Arnulf authored commentaries on the Ovidian corpus including the *Fasti*,⁷ *Amores*,⁸ *Ars amatoria*,⁹ and *Remedia amoris*,¹⁰ commentaries on the *Heroides*, *Tristia*, and *Epistulae ex Ponto* are also attributed to him.¹¹ In addition to the works of Ovid, Arnulf also wrote a substantial commentary on Lucan's *Bellum civile*¹² (i.e. *Pharsalia*). Lastly, commentaries on the works of Horace, the pseudo-Plautine *Querolus* and elegiac comedies are likely spurious attributions.¹³ The manuscript evidence for the circulation and dissemination of his commentaries spans the late twelfth through the fifteenth century and attests to the schoolmaster's influence.¹⁴

Authorship of many commentaries can be attributed reliably to Arnulf due to the commentator's fondness of embedding a self-referential colophon as the final gloss. For example,

Arnulf's final gloss on the *Metamorphoses* in which he inserts himself into the poem usurping the first person by appending a prepositional phrase to the final line (lemmata in italics):

indeflebile anime siquidem bonorum non deflentur, immo malorum unde et anima Rufi Arnulfi, qui has glosulas fecit Aurelianus, defleri non debet si eas bene fecit immo *si quid habent ueri uatum presagia uiuam cum Ouidio.*

unlamentable, indeed the souls of the good are not lamented, rather those of wicked; and for this reason the soul of Rufus Arnulfus, who made these glosses in Orléans, should not be lamented if he made them well – no, wait – if the vagaries of poets have any truth I shall live with Ovid.

Other examples are found in his commentaries on *Remedia amoris*, *Fasti*, and *Bellum ciuile*.¹⁵ The comments always serve as markers of the commentator's *auctoritas*, and are aggressive, even polemical, displays of self-aggrandizement. Consider his self-referential colophon to the *Remedia amoris*¹⁶ in which he engages deliberately his rival, Fulco who authored his own commentary to the *Remedia*:¹⁷

Postmodo, postquam legeritis et sanati fueritis, soluētis quod uouistis, quia eger sanitatem recepit per hoc opus 'De remediis' quod Arnulfus glosauit ad sanandos illos qui a Fulcone fuerant decepti.

Afterwards after you read and are cured, you'll get what you prayed for, because the sick man reclaimed his

5. Rouse and Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses*, 101-52, 153-90.

6. See Rouse and Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses*, 131-52 for the contents and structure of the *Florilegium Angelicum*; also Burton, *Classical Authors in the Florilegium Gallicum and Related Manuscripts*; Rouse, 'Florilegia and Latin Authors in the Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans', 131-60.

7. Rieker, *Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule Ouidii Fastorum*.

8. Coulson and Roy, *Incipitarius*, no. 201.

9. Coulson and Roy, *Incipitarius*, nos. 252 and 398; selections and an *accessus* in Ghisalberti, 'Arnolfo d'Orléans un cultore', 172-6.

10. Roy and Shooner, 'Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule de Remediis amoris', 135-96.

11. Coulson and Roy, *Incipitarius*, nos. 183, 248, and 306 and 206 respectively.

12. Marti, *Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule super Lucanum*.

13. See Roy, 'Arnulf of Orléans and the

Latin "Comedy", 258-66; challenged in Suchomsky, *Lateinische Comediae des 12.*

Jahrhunderts, 279-80; and Rizzo, 'Due note sulla commedia elegiaca medievale, II', 97-103.

14. See Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 97-144 for descriptions of major manuscripts of the *accessus* and *Glossulae*, and 151-7 for affiliations; Coulson and Roy, *Incipitarius*, no. 419 for a fuller list, and no. 257 lists manuscripts of the *Mutationes* and *Allegoriae*; see Rieker, *Arnulfi Aurelianensis*, lii-lvii; and Marti, *Arnulfi Aurelianensis*, ix-lxvi for only those used in her edition.

15. See Gura, 'From the *Orléanais* to Pistoia', 177-9.

16. Roy and Shooner, 'De remediis', 135.

17. See Coulson and Roy, *Incipitarius*, nos. 415 and 106.

18. Ward, 'From Marginal Gloss', 117; see also Gura, 'From the *Orléanais* to Pistoia', 179.

19. See Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 163-6 for the edited text; Ghisalberti, 'Arnolfo un cultore', 180-1

health through this work, 'De remediis', which Arnulf glossed to cure those who had been deceived by Fulco.

Arnulf's use of the self-referential colophon shows more than an indication of 'the growth of *auctoritas* around select major names'.¹⁸ The embedded colophons provide examples of the personal connection he feels toward his work, but also show an awareness of competing texts in the area.

However, Arnulf's commentary to the *Metamorphoses* distinguishes itself from the other commentaries circulating in the Loire during the period. In addition to an *accessus*¹⁹ and glosses (*Glossulae*), the commentary also contains a list of transformations (*Mutationes*), and allegorizations (*Allegoriae*) for each of the poem's fifteen books. The *Glossulae* are primarily grammatical and philological in nature, emphasizing a clear understanding of the literal sense of the text. Arnulf is not concerned with an abstract interpretation or secondary exposition,²⁰ which are both found in his *Allegoriae*. The glosses address numerous areas²¹ often problematic to his audience of elementary readers of Latin: morphology, grammar, syntax, patronymics and matronymics, geographical locales, mythological and astrological references, and the general ability to understand the expression of ideas conveyed by the Latin. However, not all of the *Glossulae* are overtly pedantic; the commentator also addresses the overall structure of the poem, textual *cruces* and variant readings. Much of the commentary is original, but Arnulf makes use of many sources through direct and indirect routes of transmission. He also draws on an unknown source circulating in the area, of which Uggucione of Pisa also knew and used in his *Deriuationes*.²² Following the *Glossulae* for each book of the poem are Arnulf's *Mutationes*, and then the *Allegoriae*,

which are combinations of allegorical, historical, and moral expositions for each *fabula*. These three sections form the complete commentary and alternate in this fashion for each of the fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*. The commentary was highly influential in the centuries to follow, informing numerous commentators, teachers, and scholars, of which many notable medieval and renaissance examples survive. The anonymous 'Vulgate' commentator of the mid-thirteenth century incorporates much of Arnulf into his commentary verbatim.²³ Italian humanists, Zomino da Pistoia and Damiano da Pola both used Arnulf's commentaries to lecture:²⁴ Zomino possessed medieval copies of at least two of Arnulf's works and also wrote a modified version of the *Glosulae* in his own autograph,²⁵ and Damiano annotated his own manuscript of the *Metamorphoses* with Arnulf's glosses.²⁶ In the north, German humanist, Amplonius Rating de Berka, owned a mutilated thirteenth-century copy of the complete commentary inserted into a manuscript among other glossed Ovidian works.²⁷ The *Allegoriae*, which likely begin the *Metamorphoses*' allegorical tradition,²⁸ influenced John of Garland's allegorical versification of the *Metamorphoses*, the *Integumenta Ovidii*,²⁹ and were drawn on explicitly by Giovanni del Virgilio,³⁰ and Pierre Bersuire for his *Ovidius moralizatus*.³¹ Such broad dissemination, use, and influence has left behind a robust manuscript tradition.

Manuscripts and Textual Transmission

Geographically, the manuscript tradition of the commentary is strong in France, but a definitive Italian tradition appears as early as the first quarter of the thirteenth century and continues through the fifteenth.³² However, as the commentary cycles between two different manuscript formats, *catena*³³

suffers the same drawbacks discussed in n.1.

20. See Hexter, 'Medieval Articulations', 77.

21. The following categories are treated in-depth in Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 59-88.

22. The *Derivationes* are edited in Cecchini, ed., *Uguccione da Pisa Derivationes*. For the similarities, see Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 89-90; Holzworth, 'Hugutio's *Derivationes*', 259-76; Rieker, *Arnulfi Aureliensis*, xxxv-xxxvi; Marti, *Arnulfi Aureliensis*, lxxiii-lxxvi.

23. Generally, see Coulson, *The 'Vulgate' Commentary*, 1-17; Coulson, 'The Vulgate Commentary', 29-61; Zeeman, 'In the Schoolroom', 1-18; Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 47-8.

24. Gura, 'From the Orléanais to Pistoia', 185-7 for the humanists.

25. Found in Pistoia, Biblioteca Forteguerriana Comunale, A 46.

26. BAV, Vat. lat. 5222.

27. See Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 107-116 for a description; also Gura,

'From the *Orléanais* to Pistoia', 186.

28. Coulson, 'The Vulgate Commentary', 57, n. 11; generally, Born, 'Ovid and Allegory', 362-79.

29. Ghisalberti, ed., *Giovanni di Garlandia: 'Integumenta Ovidii'*.

30. See Ghisalberti, 'Giovanni del Virgilio', 1-110; Ballistreri, 'Le *Allegoriae ovidiane*', 100-13.

31. See Ghisalberti, 'L'*Ovidius moralizatus*', 6-136; Coulson, *The Vulgate Commentary*, 4-5; Hexter, 'The *Allegari* of Pierre Bersuire', 51-84.

32. See Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 46, and notes 112 and 113. The principle Italian MSS are: Bodleian, Canon., class. lat. 1, 1200-1250 (O); Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 36.18, 1300-1400 (F); BAV, Vat. lat. 5222, c. 1415 (D); Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 18 inf., 1420-1500 (A); Pistoia, Biblioteca Forteguerriana Comunale, A 46, 1400-1458 (Z).

33. The term is used and defined by Ward, 'From Marginal Gloss to Catena Commentary',

and *scholion*, it undergoes a metamorphosis of its own assuming various hybridized versions and modified forms. The earliest extant manuscripts are transmitted in the *catena* format, and date between the end of the twelfth through the early thirteenth century, close to Arnulf's *floruit*. These are (with *sigla*):

BSB, Clm. 7205, 1175-1200 (M)

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. XIV.222 (4007), 1175-1200 (V)

Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Q 91, 1200-1225 (T)

BnF, lat. 8001, 1200-1225 [text of Arnulf inserted within a twelfth-century copy of *Met.*] (P)

The manuscripts were copied clearly in an educational environment: they do not maintain a uniformity of script within themselves (Plates 19 and 20), and have great variability in formality and level of execution. The scripts of each manuscript may be identified readily as bookhands which display the transitional features of the period,³⁴ though the need for rapid forms surpasses the scribes' deliberate attempts at a more formalized 'Gothic' treatment. Examples include: descenders curving sharply to the left; final limb of uncial **m** curves to the left below the line and extends beneath the second minim when found in initial position, within a word, and at word-end within a line;³⁵ the presence of *litterae elongatae* (Plate 19); breaking of **g** (Fig. 6); atrophying of the two-compartment **a** leading to Semitextualis (Plate 21). The palaeographical evidence depicts an environment of production where speed is the most important factor, which, in turn, must be linked to demand. The choice of format,




Fig. 6. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 7205, fol. 29v (detail)

catena, for M, V, T, and P also indicates a need for rapid dissemination of the text.

In brief, *catena* format is an example of a utilitarian tradition used in oral lectures of authoritative masters. The format enjoyed popularity in the late eleventh, twelfth, and early thirteenth century.³⁶ When in *catena* format, a commentary becomes a primary text and is virtually separated from its object (i.e. the text upon which it comments). The only remnants of the object are truncated lemmata, which are usually underlined. The syntax of the lemmata often govern the grammatical features of their glosses including morphology, noun-adjective agreement, subject-verb agreement, sequence of tense, and antecedents of pronouns. In addition to syntax, lemmata may also influence stylistic features, most notably word order and thus emphasis. These relationships are features which allow the lemmata to act as links between text and commentary (hence Ward's term '*catena*'), and enable a continuous reading of both text and commentary. If the reader is unaware of this relationship between lemma, gloss, and the context of the object, reading can be difficult. A gloss on the murder of Androgeus from Book 7 illustrates this relationship [lemmata are in *italics*]:

Androgeique necem iustis ulciscitur armis. (Ovid, *Met.* 7.458)³⁷

109; see Gura, 'From the *Orléanais* to Pistoia', for a study of the format beyond Ward's sample of rhetorical texts.

34. See Kwakkel, 'Biting, Kissing and the Treatment of Feet', 86-102; Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books*, 56-71.

35. Identified by Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books*, 62 as an alternative form at the end of line.

36. See Ward, 'From Marginal Gloss', 109-20 for the seminal study; Gura, 'From the *Orléanais* to Pistoia', 171-88 for an extension of Ward's hypotheses and bibliography, and the resurgence of the format by Humanists.

37. Arnulf's text of the *Metamorphoses* is

a version belonging to Tarrant's Σ class; see Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 93-6 for Arnulf's text; and Tarrant's OCT edition, xxii-xxiv for the Σ class. All quotations of the *Metamorphoses* text are from Tarrant's edition.

[and he avenged the murder of Androgeus justly with arms].

Androgei filii sui quem Athenienses necauerunt. (Arnulf, *Glos.* 7.458)

[of *Androgeus*, his own son, whom the Athenians murdered].

Minos, the subject of *ulciscitur*, is expressed at *Met.* 7.456 (*bella parat Minos*), but appears in the gloss as *sui*. The antecedent of the reflexive adjective may only be inferred by the reader if he is aware of the poem's grammar. Arnulf uses apposition as the predicative construction employing the genitive forms *filii sui*.

The manuscripts of Arnulf's commentary in *catena* format contain the *accessus* followed by the *Glosulae*, *Mutationes*, and *Allegoriae* in the same alternating arrangement per book, though **M** is the only complete witness (**V**, **T**, and **P** are in various fragmentary states). **P** especially shows signs of a divergent tradition: the *Mutationes* and *Allegoriae* for Books 3-15 follow continuously the *accessus* and *Glosulae* to Books 1, 2, and the first five of Book 3 (six lines of text in **P**). The first gloss of the respective *Glosulae* precedes the *Allegoriae* for some books only. It is clear that **P** was copied from a manuscript containing the entire commentary, but the demand for allegory surpassed that for philology. The Arnulfian material was inserted subsequently into a twelfth-century copy of the *Metamorphoses*. The textual divergence seen in **P** is realized fully as the commentary's format changes from *catena* to *scholion* (marginal and interlinear glossing) throughout the thirteenth century. The different sections of the commentary circulate independently, in hybrid forms, and become paired

with or incorporated into other texts.³⁸ A notable example is the circulation of the *Allegoriae* with John of Garland's *Integumenta Ovidii*.

The *catena* format serves as the primary vehicle for the commentary's dissemination to later periods. It allows the text to move quickly and succinctly on the page. Since the commentary circulates independently of the object's full text, *catena* commentaries furnish portable exemplars for subsequent oral lectures, copying into *scholion* format, or insertion into other manuscripts (as is the case with T). As the popularity of *scholion* grows in the thirteenth century, that of the *catena* begins to wane. Two thirteenth-century manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses*, both originating from the region, are two *scholion* witnesses of the commentary which derive definitively from *catena* exemplars:

BL, Burney 224, 1200-1250 (B)

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf.

13.10, Aug. 4°, 1250-1300 (W).

Though the complete text is contained, the systematic functionality of Arnulf's twelfth-century *catena* commentary is transformed. For the first time in the extant tradition, Arnulf's text must compete for space on the page with that of others, including Ovid. The *Glosulae* are copied in *scholion* format in the margins and interlineally in both manuscripts; the *accessus*, however, precedes the *Metamorphoses* in B (fol. 2r), but follows it in W (fol. 141v). The *Mutationes* and *Allegoriae* also undergo changes. In W, the *Allegoriae* are written in the margins wherever the scribe could find space and scattered throughout each book, sometimes appearing near their corresponding *fabulae*, others near the beginning of each

38. See Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 97-145 for descriptions of manuscripts.

39. The *Allegoriae* are also written as continuous prose, but introduced by the *accessus* in St Omer, BM, 678, fols. 104r-111r (S); see Gura, 'From the *Orléanais* to Pistoia', 180-1.

40. MSS O, A, Z, and D of the Italian tradition omit the colophon, though it is transmitted in F.

41. Ovid's Theban cycle is often read in contrast with the *Aeneid*; see Hardie, 'Ovid's Theban History: The First 'Anti-Aeneid'?', 224-35; cf. Janan, *Reflections in a Serpent's Eye*, ch. 7 for a psychoanalytical approach and discussion of 'overly Vergil-centric view of later epic writers' (via Robinson, review of *Reflections in a Serpent's Eye*, 385-6).

book with the *Mutationes* (Plate 22). The *Glosulae* compete with scholia written previously: for example, the *Glosulae* are copied in *catena* on W fol. 1v due to lack of space on fol. 2r (where the *Met.* begins), then switch to *scholion* on fol. 2v for the rest of the poem. In B, the *Mutationes* and *Allegoriae* are written as continuous prose following the poem with the *Glosulae* in *scholion* format.³⁹

The shift of format marks also a utilitarian shift from oral lecture to reading strategy. However, the *auctoritas* of Arnulf remains present as his colophon accompanies the *Glosulae* in almost all known *scholion* manuscripts, including those which lack the *Allegoriae*.⁴⁰

Glossing Cadmus the Hero

Arnulf's pedagogical rigor is best seen through a close textual reading of his commentary on a particular episode in the *Metamorphoses*. This method organically encompasses the commentator's multifaceted approaches to his glosses in the order which they occur within the narrative of Ovid's text. The personal and authoritative connection he feels with Ovid's poem is elicited through a similar reading of his *Allegoriae*, in which his transformation of classical *mythos* into medieval *fabula* results in self-referential allegorical exposition. The arrival of Cadmus and his founding of Thebes is a powerful example of these features as well as a testament to the enduring popularity of Arnulf.

Ovid initiates his version of the Theban Cycle⁴¹ as he transitions from the story of Jupiter and Europa, which concludes Book 2, to that of Cadmus and the founding of Thebes in Book 3. The 'House of Cadmus' will occupy the narrative through the majority of Book 4, which contains Cadmus' own serpentine transformation. Book 3 begins

with *iamque* (as he does Books 7 and 14) raising the reader's expectation of an unbroken continuation of the previous story. Arnulf is quick to gloss Ovid's veiled mention of Europa's rape which occupies only the first two lines of the book (*Iamque deus posita se confessus* deuirginando eam – *the god had already placed aside his disguise and revealed himself by taking her virginity*); the gloss then resolves the geographical movement to Crete, anchored by the adjective *Dictea* in 3.2 (*'Dictea Cretensia a Dictis quadam ciuitate Crete – Dictean means Cretan, taken from Dicte, a particular city in Crete'*).⁴² Arnulf employs an etymological approach for proper adjective *Boeotia* at 3.13 where Apollo's oracle gives Cadmus the prophecy (*'Boetia a boue inuenta uel Boetia auxiliaria; Boetius enim adiutor – Boeotian is taken from "bos" (cow) or Boeotian means "helping", for this reason "Boethius" means "helper"'*). The gloss conveys effectively the Greek to Latin connotations of cow (βοῦς/bos), but presents an alternative (and spurious) etymology from 'help' or 'aid' (βοηθέω); the commentator then digresses briefly on a tangent for his students, by explaining the etymology again with reference to Boethius, an author well known in the medieval classroom. The etymological approach is abandoned for a mythographic one to gloss the final geographical movement from Delphi to the outer borders of Boeotia. Delphi is referenced at 3.15 through the 'Castalian cave' (*Castalio...antro*) though the adjective properly refers to the spring, which Arnulf interprets as an aetiological myth for a region and the spring itself: *'Castalio Castalis nimpha fuit; ibi sepulta et ab ea regio et fons dictus est – Castalian Castalis was a nymph; she was buried there and the region and spring take their name from her'*. The treatment of *Panopes* at 3.19 is similar (*'Panopes regio quedam a regina, uel a nimpha sic dicta – Panope is*

42. The adjective is used and glossed again at 8.43 to describe Minos (*Dictei a Dicti ciuitate Crete*).

43. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books I-5*, 342.

44. The first of which may derive ultimately from Servius *In Aen.* 11.661 where the same adjective describes Penthesileia: *Martia aut bellicosa*.

a certain region named after a queen or nymph'), though Arnulf's alternative explanation identifies Panope with the sea-nymph mentioned in *Aeneid* 5.240 rather than the city on the Cephissus River.

After the narrative is situated firmly in Boeotia, the companions of Cadmus soon encounter the serpent of Mars in the cave as they search for fresh water. Ovid's introduction of the serpent at 3.32 intrigues the commentator, and prompts him to address the use of vocabulary and accompanying stylistic features:

Marcus bellicosus uel Marti sacratus; anguis proprie est aquarum, serpens terre, draco uolans aeris, et draco templorum; cristis et auro id est aureis cristis lucidis ad modum auri et est endiadis.

Martian is warlike, or sacred to Mars; *anguis* is properly a water-snake, 'serpens' is one on land, 'draco uolans' a serpent of the air, and 'draco' is one found in temples; *with crests and gold* means with golden crests that are shiny like gold, and it is an hendiadys.

As Anderson notes, the association of the serpent with Mars is unclear;⁴³ Arnulf presents both a figurative and more literal interpretation.⁴⁴ The commentator also takes issue with the use of *anguis* for a serpent on land rather than one in the water, and proceeds to explain the correct vocabulary for the varieties of snakes found in the water, land, air, and those who guard temples. He then identifies Ovid's use of *cristis et auro* as a hendiadys (ἐν διαὶ δύοῖν: *one through two*), the rhetorical feature in which two substantives are used in lieu of one substantive and an adjective (or genitive), and presents

the anticipated adjective-noun unit *aureis cristis* to describe the serpent's crest. The description of the serpent culminates at 3.44-5 as it rears up and its sheer size is experienced by the companions of Cadmus. Grammatically, line 44 is considered problematic by Arnulf:

despiciit deorsum aspiciit supereminens. *quanto qui* anguis determinans Arthos protenditur in austrum ubi deprimitur terra, sic quod totus uideri non potest.

it looks down means it looks at the grove downwards as it looms above it. *as large as the one* means the serpent that bounds the Arctos [*the Twin Bears*] is stretched forth southward where it is sunk down by the land, because in this way the serpent cannot be seen entirely.

A literal interpretation of *despicere* is preferred to the verb's usual figurative usage and is glossed with an adverb-verb-participle construction. The enormous size of the serpent is expressed via a correlation between the physical serpent and the constellation which divides the Greater and Lesser Bears. Arnulf chooses his lemma to guide the student through the parenthesis beginning line 45 and then explains the correlation (though does not address that, according to Ovid, the serpent is about twice as large as the constellation). The snake looms over the men, who are now described as 'Phoenicians' (3.46), which prompts both a mythographic summary and an interesting etymological variant:

Phenicas tres fuerunt fratres: Phenix a quo dicta est Phenicia regio, Cilix a quo dicta Cilicia, et Cadmus qui condidit Thebas; isti tres missi sunt pro sorore querenda

45. Mythog. I. 145;
Mythog. II. 98.

46. Prisc. II. 21.1;
11.40.7; see TLL, vol.
X, 2, p. 2650, line 11;
p. 2651, line. 50.

47. Cf. 7.1 where Arnulf provides an alternative etymology of the Minyians from *minium*: '...socii Iasonis populus sic dictus a minio colore quia eiusdem coloris sunt cum minio – Jason's companions were a people thus named from the color red because they were of the same color as red lead'.

quam tamen non inuenerunt; uel *Phenices* dicti sunt a rubris capillis; 'pheniceos' enim Grece 'rubrum' Latine, postea mutata est 'e' in 'u' et ablata 'h' dicti sunt 'Punices', deinde breuitatis causa dicti sunt 'Puni'.

Phoenicians were three brothers: Phoenix from whom the region Phoenicia is named, Cilix after whom Cilicia is named, and Cadmus, who founded Thebes. These three were sent to search for their sister whom, in spite of this, they did not find; or they are called *Phoenicean* due to red hair. In fact, 'phoinikeos' is Greek for the Latin 'rubrum'; after the letter *e* was changed into *u* and the *h* dropped out, they were called 'Punices', then for the sake of brevity they were called 'Puni'.

The first explanation, a mythographic summary of the sons of Agenor and their foundations draws heavily on either the First or Second Vatican Mythographer (or both),⁴⁵ as it contextualizes the reference. The appended etymology, however, reflects a strong grammatical focus. Likely informed by Priscian,⁴⁶ Arnulf explains the bizarre linguistic transformation from the assimilated form *phoeniceus*, -a, -um to *puniceus*, -a, -um to describe a reddish hue. In order to contextualize why the men are 'reddish', Arnulf, also known as Rufus for his red hair, interprets the adjective to mean the Phoenicians could have reddish hair as well.⁴⁷

Leading up to his battle with the serpent, Cadmus searches for his missing companions and discovers their corpses. The time of day, high noon, is expressed at 3.50 as *fecerat exiguas iam sol altissimus umbras*, which Arnulf explains simply ('*sol altissimus* in meridie – the sun is at its highest at mid-day'). The interpretation of vocabulary, especially when

verbs use literal rather than figurative meanings (e.g. *despicit* in 3.44), is a favorite of the commentator. When Cadmus tracks his men, Ovid uses the verb *uestigare* which Arnulf glosses with a literal interpretation (*'uestigat id est uestigia eorum sequitur – he tracks that is to say he follows their foot-prints'*). Unusual vocabulary receives consistent attention such as the use of *letata* at 3.55 when Cadmus discovers the corpses of his companions. Likely an Ovidian coinage, forms of the verb occur only in this passage and *Ibis* 505,⁴⁸ prompting the commentator to gloss the form in terms of meaning and etymology (*'letata mortificata a leto – deathed means the bodies were destroyed; the word is from “death” [letum]'*). By this point in the twelfth century, medieval orthography also creates false homonyms due to the loss of diphthongs, of which *letata* is a prime example which could be misinterpreted by Arnulf's audience of elementary readers (cf. class. *laetata*). Arnulf treats the substantive use of the adjective *molaris*, -e, common in poetry, used at 3.59 in a similar fashion: *'molarem lapidem magnum ad modum mole – millstone [molaris] is a large stone like a millstone [mola]'*. The commentator then uses the newly glossed vocabulary word in his comment to explain the success of Cadmus' *iaculum* where the millstone failed: *'duricia eadem qua uicerat molarem – the same hardness with which the serpent had overcome the millstone'*. The subject of *accessit* in 3.72 is enjambed and thus delayed until the beginning of the next line (*causa recens*), which also makes the reflexive nature of the participle *solitas* ambiguous. Arnulf explains the phrase outside the language of grammar as *'solitas sibi domesticas dum accessit: de uulnere dicit – while it added to the usual [anger], [which is] proper to itself: he is talking about the wound'*.

Ovid graphically describes the serpent's death at the

48. The verb also occurs in *Culex*, 325.

hands of Cadmus, complete with swelling, convulsing, and foaming. Unusual forms are glossed with synonyms (3.74: '*albida* idem est quod *alba* – *white* [*albida*] is the same thing as *white* [*alba*']) and perfect passive participles are glossed and etymologized (3.75: '*rasa squamis exasperata a rado*, -is – *scraped* by the scales means stirred up by them; it is from *rado*, *radere* [*to scrape*]'). Despite the use of *spira* in the earlier description of the serpent, Arnulf glosses the contextual meaning in geometric terms, explaining how a *spira* can make an *orbis*: '*spiris* spira est circulus imperfectus non ad idem punctum rediens – *by the coils* a "spira" is an imperfect circle and it does not return to the same point'. When the serpent rushes upon Cadmus and is compared to a flood at 3.79, the assault is rendered as *impete uasto*; the usage of *impete* is explained via an alternative form: '*impete* pro inpetu nec plus inuenitur sicut nec de sponte rite ritu – *with an attack* [*impete*] is used for "impetus", and it is not found more just as "rite" is not freely used for "ritu"'. As the snake attempts to draw itself back, the accusative-infinitive unit *plagam sedere* is glossed in more literal terms: '*plagam sedere* id est in profundo locum tenere – *the wound settling* that is to say, taking a place deeply'. Before the beast expires, it becomes stuck to a tree by the spear and the commentator's final gloss on the episode explains in simple terms the 'virtual zeugma' noted by Anderson⁴⁹ in 3.92 ('*cum robore arboris; ceruix serpentis* – *with the hardness* of the tree; *the neck* of the snake').

The following episode in which Cadmus sows the serpent's teeth and the autochthonous Spartoi fight receives only two glosses from Master Arnulf. The first explains the phrase *mortalia semina* in apposition to the *iussos dentes* in 3.105, providing an alternative grammatical construction followed by a different rendering of the sense of *mortalia*: '*mortalia*

semina mortalium uel humana quia homines sunt procreati – *mortal seeds* means seeds of mortals, or they are human seeds because human beings were brought forth from them'. The alternative interpretation, *humana*, emphasizes the humanity of the armed men, whom Arnulf specifies are human beings (*homines*) rather than some monstrous race. The use of *mortalia*, however, suggests only that what springs from the ground can die. At the end of the founding myth, Ovid mentions only Echion by name out of the five surviving Spartoi, and in his compendiose fashion, Arnulf appends the other names:⁵⁰

50. Cf. Mythog. II. 76.

quorum fuit unus Echion et alius Ideus, tercius Cromis [sic], quartus Iperon, quintus Pelorus; uel unus eorum fuit Bromius ut quidam dicunt.

One of whom was Echion and another was Udaeus, the third was Chromius, the fourth was [sc.] Hyperenor, the fifth was Pelorus; or Bromius was one of them as certain people say.

When Arnulf seeks to distance himself from the comments of others, he uses phrases like *ut quidam dicunt* or *secundum alios*. The commentator appears rightly skeptical of identifying Bromius with one of the Spartoi; at 4.11 he identifies correctly the form as a name for Bacchus (complete with etymology). After the grammatical exposition for the entirety of Book 3 concludes, the schoolmaster moves to allegory.

Magister Cadmus and Allegorical Serpent's Teeth

Arnulf uses the *Mutationes* to recapitulate the transformations of Book 3 as a segue into his allegorical interpretation.

It is in the *Allegoriae* that the commentator's recontextualization of the founding myth assumes a more personal tone of a familiar discourse between master and student.

The founding myth (*Met.* 3.1-130) contains three different transformations according to Arnulf's list of *Mutationes*: Cadmus from a king to an exile, the serpent's teeth into seeds, and the seeds into armed men. In his *accessus*,⁵¹ Arnulf addresses the concept of transformation from two perspectives when discussing the *materia* (subject matter) of the work. The first is the way in which a particular metamorphosis occurs: natural (*naturalis*), magical (*magica*), or spiritual (*spiritualis*). Natural metamorphoses are corporeal, elemental transformations (*per contexionem elementorum uel retexionem*), magical ones are those brought about through sorcery (*per prestigia magorum*), which may change the *corpus* but not the *animus*, and spiritual changes are those that deal explicitly with the *spiritus* (*circa spiritum*) and alter abstract or mental qualities. The second division is formed from the Aristotelian categories of matter: animate to animate, inanimate to inanimate, inanimate to animate, and animate to inanimate. When applied to the founding myth, the commentator's distinctions reveal a spiritual metamorphosis of animate to animate matter (*Cadmus de rege in exulem*), a natural transformation of inanimate to inanimate matter (*dentes serpentis in semen*), and another 'natural' change, but from inanimate to animate matter (*semen in milites armatos*).

In his *Allegoriae*, Arnulf compartmentalizes the transformations and his expositions are either historical, allegorical, or moral. Combinations of the categories are found in some expositions. For example in the transformations of Tereus, Procne, and Philomela in Book 6, Arnulf acknowledges the events relayed in the myth as historical, but their

respective metamorphoses as purely allegorical ('Quod de Tereus et Progne et Philomena dicitur totum est historicum, de mutatione uero allegoricum – what is said about Tereus and Procne and Philomena is completely historical, but, concerning their transformation, it is allegorical'). The commentator does not always specify the type for each transformation, as in the case of the *Allegoriae* for Book 3: 'Modo quasdam historice quasdam allegorice quasdam moraliter exponamus – Now, let us explain certain transformations historically, some allegorically, others morally'. The *Allegoriae* for Cadmus and the founding of Thebes are historical and allegorical interpretations set against a mythographic and rhetorical background – moral exposition is barely present for these sections. Arnulf creates his own allegorical epyllion and recasts the entire myth in familiar terms to the medieval classroom.

The mythographic explanation of the three brothers, the same *Phoenices* of 3.46, is recontextualized to situate Cadmus' migration from Phoenicia as a historical event before turning quickly to allegory. Apollo and his oracle at Delphi have no historical position in this exposition, but rather the prophecy is glossed simply as Cadmus turning to his own innate wisdom (*consilio Appolinis, id est sapientie sue*). Throughout the exposition, Arnulf portrays Cadmus as the sagacious bringer of writing and oratory (thus education) to the Greeks. *Alleg.* 3.3 lays the foundation for this portrayal strongly in historical and allegorical terms:

Cadmus reuera sapientissimus fuit qui in Greciam deuenit, ubi iam inuente erant litere in lingua Hebraica, uoluit Grecis litterarum doctrinam manifestare; ubi bos iacebat, id est ubi homines uentri dediti pascendo gule erant intenti non studio.

52. *Hist.* 5.58.1.

53. *Bel. ciu.* 3.220.

54. *Etym.* 1.3.4-6.

55. *Cat.* 2.7-9.

56. See Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission*, 341-7; esp. 343-57 for the manuscript tradition in France.

Cadmus really was the wisest man who arrived in Greece [from Phoenicia], where letters had already been discovered in the Hebrew language and he wanted to make the teaching of letters known to the Greeks; 'where the cow was laying' means where men were addicted to their bellies through grazing like cattle – they were intent upon gluttony not study.

The Phoenician origin of the Greek alphabet specifically through Cadmus and his companions was known in antiquity, for example through Herodotus⁵² and Lucan.⁵³ Arnulf draws primarily on Isidore of Seville⁵⁴ for the Hebrew parentage of Greek and Latin letter forms as he depicts Cadmus as the magister dispensing his *doctrina* to the Greeks. The oracle's prophecy is explained first in allegorical, then in moralistic terms. The location of Cadmus' city, which begins to seem more and more like a school, is a place where men do not exercise their intellect, but are addicted to their physical appetites. The description and choice of language are similar to Sallust's⁵⁵ description of those who pass idly through life. For Sallust, these men are not only slothful (*dediti uentri atque somno*) but also uneducated and uncultured (*indocti incultique*). Arnulf advances a more literal interpretation of *uentri* strengthened by *pascendo* resulting that the Greeks there have succumbed to a vice, gluttony (*gula*), and were neglectful of *studium*. The exposition continues the Sallustian discourse of bodily gratification in lieu of mental development.⁵⁶ Cadmus' companions (*socii*) sent to fetch fresh water for the ritual libation are then transformed by Arnulf into students (*discipuli*) seeking out other pupils of vigorous talent (*uiuidi ingenii*) with whom to vie. It is here that classical declamation and oratory are transformed into medieval

disputation. The vocabulary used to allegorize the remaining sections of the founding myth creates an agonistic discourse of rhetorical style. The *fons* for the sacrificial water becomes a location where the plain style (*subtilis*) abounds and the act of drawing the pure water is thus attracting students through eloquence (*facundia*). Arnulf explains the death of Cadmus' companions as their rhetorical defeat (*confutare*), not by the serpent of Mars with its triple-toothed bite, but rather by more eloquent speakers (*facundiores*) who wield a biting and witty style (*mordendo*).

In Ovid's account, Cadmus is styled in the manner of Hercules with a lion's skin, wielding both spear and javelin. Arnulf remakes Cadmus the hero into Cadmus the orator:

Cadmus uero pelle leonis indutus, id est ferox, et duo hastilia ferens, facundia et sapientia munitus, socios disputando confutatos uindicare desiderans disputando...

Cadmus was dressed in a lion's skin, that is to say he was wild, and he carried two spears means he was protected by his eloquence and wisdom, as he desired to deliver, with his own disputation, his companions who had been put to silence through disputation...

The orator is wild and courageous (*ferox*), and his epic weaponry is his eloquence (*facundia*) and wisdom (*sapientia*) emphasized previously. The above passage contains other, more subtle transformations of the character of Cadmus. Ovid's Cadmus is motivated by vengeance: he will either avenge his dead companions or die trying (3.58-9). Arnulf rearticulates the hero's apostrophe: the *ultor* is recast as *uindicare desiderans*. The departure from *ulcisci* to *uindicare* is a shift from the

57. Cf. Ps.-Sallust, *Ep.* 2.9.3.

58. *subtilis* as a genre is for *probare*; see Cic. *Or.* 69; Reynolds, ed., *Texts Transmission*, 102-9 for the circulation of the rhetorical works; Pernot, *Rhetoric in Antiquity*, 228 for a list of passages on styles.

explicit motives of vengeance and punishment to those of liberation, defense, and deliverance. The specific use of language allows Arnulf's Cadmus, the wise orator, to be driven by a desire to liberate and defend his students by engaging in his own disputation.

The battle between Cadmus and the serpent, now a disputation, is couched in rhetorical terms. Arnulf is concerned only with Cadmus' assault, of which three points receive exposition: Cadmus' first attempt to wound the snake, his failure to do so, and his third, successful attempt. The *molaris* glossed literally in the *Glosulae*, becomes, in allegory, useless argumentations of which the particulars are known, but unspecified (*quasdam argumentationes nullius utilitatis*). The impervious nature of the snake becomes a stylistic defense. The locals, whom Arnulf calls *indigenae*, are presumably the Greeks described earlier. Their lack of a writing-system does not prevent them from thwarting Cadmus' first attempt in the disputation. Their speech, however, is not the plain style (*subtilis*) sought by Cadmus' students, but rather is one wrought with cleverness (*calliditas*). Arnulf creates a stylistic battle within his own narrative, allowing the *calliditas* of the Greeks to overcome, albeit briefly, the *sapientia* which so informs Cadmus and his oratory.⁵⁷ In the disputation, Cadmus triumphs by using intelligent precision and subtlety along with the plain style in his maxims: his *sententiae* are *acutiores* and *subtiliores* compared to those of the Greeks. The use of comparatives emphasizes Cadmus' stylistic mastery and effective use of genre, while his choice of the plain style reveals his true intention: instruction and proof.⁵⁸ Cadmus wins the disputation and thus the serpent dies.

Arnulf passes over the bridge passage and the prophetic whispers of Cadmus' future snake-form and proceeds imme-

diately to the sowing of the serpent's teeth, the next *mutatio*. He returns to Cadmus' desire to bring his *doctrina litterarum* to the Greeks, and the sowing of serpent's teeth becomes the discovery of the Greek alphabet. It is interesting that by this point in the *Allegoriae* Cadmus is no longer a Phoenician *profugus*, but has been hellenized with the impending foundation of his city. The commentator must recontextualize the historical and allegorical context of his exposition to explain why the letters are represented by teeth:

Postea dentes serpentis seminavit, id est literas Grecas inuenit; unde dicitur Grecorum primus uestigat grama-ta Cadmus; litere Grece dentes serpentis dicuntur potiusquam alie quia astutiores et subtiliores sunt Greci quam alii, uel quia astutiores sunt homines poetice professionis quam laici uel propter satiricos qui mordaces sunt.

After he sowed the serpent's teeth, that is discovered Greek letters; whence Cadmus is said to be the first of the Greeks who traced out the alphabet. Greek letters are called 'serpent's teeth' rather than other letters because the Greeks are more precise and plainer speakers than other peoples, either because men of poetic expression are more precise than laymen, or on account of the satirists who are biting.

Arnulf turns once again to the vocabulary of rhetorical style and genre. The Greeks now possess the very same mastery of oratory that Cadmus did when he confuted them in the previous disputation. As in the *Glosulae*, alternative information is appended with *uel* when there is variation in the source, or the commentator feels there may be more than one interpretation.

The bite of the allegorical serpent's teeth may either be the precision of poets, or, more specifically, the biting wit of satirists.

The final *mutatio* is the birth of the fully armed Spartoi from the teeth planted in the furrows. The teeth have already been rearticulated as letters, and from those letters now spring forth rhetors who vie with their opponents as if they were armed with weapons (*rethores qui contra aduersarios suos acsi armati sint confligunt*). Cadmus has created a formidable group of rhetoricians with his invention of writing. At this point, Arnulf consciously departs from Ovid's narrative to continue his own.⁵⁹ He does not allegorize Ovid's account of the passive Cadmus, who watches the Spartoi destroy one another after their admonition of the dangers of civil war. Rather, the commentator discusses the usual version of the myth, in which Cadmus throws a stone into the crowd of earth-born causing them to fight amongst themselves:

...et misso lapide inter eos a Cadmo, id est questione aliqua, mutuo se occidunt, id est mutuo sibi opposcentes et respondentes se confutant et confundunt.

...and after Cadmus threw a stone among them, meaning some *quaestio*, they strike each other down, that is they put themselves to silence and confuse themselves while they debate and respond among themselves.

Cadmus assumes the role of a magister presenting a *quaestio* and allows the new rhetors to confute themselves. He is able to control the discourse with barely any participation. The five surviving Spartoi whom Arnulf listed methodically by name in the *Glosulae* are further transformed. No longer rhetors, Echion and his brothers are abstracted into the vowels (*quin-*

que uocales superstites fuerunt), which Arnulf says are necessary for all speech (*dictio*) and are the foundation of all teaching (*quorum auxilio fundatur omnis doctrina*). Arnulf leaves his students with an exposition emphasizing the authority of the *magister* and the triumph of his *artes* over the local competitors. It is one in which the schoolmaster is the absolute authority whose very arrival brings education and culture.

Arnulf's approaches exemplify his authoritative and innovative method infused with the commentator's characteristic tones of self-reference. It is easy to see a bit of Arnulf and his St Euverte in the allegorical exposition of Magister Cadmus and Thebes, to which the *Glosulae* add the grammatical auctoritas necessary for the twelfth-century magister – so much so that, for Magister Arnulf, it is perfectly acceptable to correct Ovid's use of vocabulary (*Glos.* 3. 32) and even rewrite the narrative for his own purposes (*Alleg.* 3. 7-8)! The manuscript tradition testifies to the commentary's popularity and demand, and ability to stay relevant in the rich grammatical and allegorical commentary traditions of the *Metamorphoses*. Such longevity has indeed enabled Rufus Arnulfus to obtain his wish to 'live with Ovid'.

60. See Gura, 'A Critical Edition and Study', 161 for a complete list of manuscripts with sigla used to edit the *accessus* and *Glosulae*.

Critical Edition of Arnulf of Orléans' Commentary on *Met.* 3.1-126.

Manuscripts with sigla:⁶⁰

- M BSB, Clm. 7205, 1150-1200
- V Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. XIV.222 (4007), 1150-1200
- T Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Q 91, 1200-1250
- P BnF, lat. 8001, 1200-1250
- B BL, Burney 224, 1250-1300

- W Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf.
13.10. Aug. 4°, 1200-1300
O Bodleian, Canon. class. lat. 1, 1200-1300
D BAV, Vat. lat. 5222, c. 1415
A Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 18 inf., 1420-1500

Angle brackets < > indicate text supplied by the editor.

Modern conventions of capitalization and punctuation have been introduced.

Lemmata used in the *Glosulae* appear in *italics*.

Line numbers of *Metamorphoses* used in the *Glosulae* correspond to Tarrant's 2004 edition (OCT).

<GLOSVLE LIBRI III>

1. *Iamque deus posita* se confessus deuirginando eam.
2. *Dictea* Cretensia; a 'Dictis' quadam ciuitate Crete.
13. *Boetia* a 'boue' inuenta; uel Boetia auxiliaria; Boetius enim adiutor.
15. *Castalio* Castalis nimpha fuit; ibi sepulta et ab ea regio et fons dictus est.
19. *Panopes* regio quedam a regina; uel a nimpha sic dicta.
32. *Marcus* bellicosus; uel Marti sacratus; *anguis* proprie est aquarum, serpens terre, draco uolans aeris, et draco templorum. *cristis et auro* id est aureis cristis lucidis ad modum auri, et est endiadis.
44. *despicit* deorsum aspicit supereminens. *quanto qui* anguis determinans arthos
protenditur in austrum ubi deprimitur terra, sic quod totus uideri non potest.
46. *Phenicas* tres fuerunt fratres: Phenix a quo dicta est Phenicia regio, et Cilix a quo dicta Cilicia, et Cadmus qui

condidit Thebas; isti tres missi fuerunt pro sorore querenda quam tamen non inuenerunt; uel *Phenices* dicti sunt a rubris capillis, ‘pheniceos’ enim Grece ‘rubrum’ Latine, postea mutata est ‘e’ in ‘u’ et ablata ‘h’, dicti sunt ‘Punices’, deinde breuitatis causa dicti sunt ‘Puni’.

- 50. *sol altissimus* in meridie.
- 52. *uestigat* id est uestigia eorum sequitur.
- 55. *letata* mortificata a leto.
- 59. *molarem* lapidem magnum ad modum mole.
- 64. *duricia eadem* qua uicerat molarem.
- 70. *idque ubi* scilicet hastile.
- 72. *solitas* sibi domesticas *dum accessit*: de uulnere dicit.
- 74. *albida* idem est quod alba.
- 75. *rasa* squamis exasperata a ‘rado, -dis’.
- 77. *spiris* spira est circulus imperfectus non ad idem punctum rediens.
- 79. *inpete* pro inpetu, nec plus inuenitur sicut nec de sponte rite ritu.
- 88. *plagam sedere* id est in profundo locum tenere.
- 92. *cum robore* arboris. *ceruix* serpentis.
- 105. *mortalia semina* mortalium; uel humana quia homines sunt procreati.
- 126. *quorum fuit unus Echion* et alius Ideus, tercius Cromis, quartus Iperon, quintus Pelorus; uel unus eorum fuit Bromius ut quidam dicunt.

<MVTATIONES LIBRI III>

[1] Hee sunt mutationes huius libri: Cadmus de rege in exulem, dentes serpentis in semen, semen in milites armatos, Acteon in ceruum, Iuno in anum, Tyresias de uiro in feminam, de femina iterum in uirum, postea de uidente in ce-

cum, Echo in saxum, Narcissus in florem, Bachus in Acetem, naute in pisces marinos.

<ALLEGORIE LIBRI III>

[2] Modo quasdam historice quasdam allegorice quasdam moraliter exponamus. Rapta a Ioue Europa, tres fratres sui missi fuerunt pro ea querenda: Phenix a quo dicta est Phenicia et Cilix a quo dicta est Cilicia, Cadmusque qui repatriare nolens consilio Appolinis, id est sapientie sue, urbem, in quo loco bos iacebat, fundare uoluit in Grecia. [3] Cadmus reuera sapientissimus fuit qui in Greciam deuenit ubi iam inuente erant litere in lingua Hebraica, uoluit Grecis litterarum doctrinam manifestare; ubi bos iacebat, id est ubi homines uentri dediti pascendo gule erant intenti non studio. [4] Misit ergo socios, id est discipulos suos, ut sibi uiuas aquas quererent, id est discipulos uiuidi ingenii; qui uenientes ad fontem, id est locum ubi copiam subtilium esse putabant, dum aquas uiuas haurirent, id est discipulos sibi facundia allicerent, excitato serpente ab eo interfecti sunt quod ideo fingitur quia facundiores inuenerunt qui eos mordendo confutauerunt. [5] Cadmus uero pelle leonis indutus, id est ferox, et duo hastilia ferens, facundia et sapientia munitus, socios disputando confutatos uindicare desiderans disputando; contra serpentem saxum impellens, id est quasdam argumentationes nullius utilitatis; nichil serpenti, id est calliditati indigenarum nocuit; tandem iaculo, id est acutioribus et subtilioribus sententiis, eum confixit. [6] Postea dentes serpentis seminauit, id est literas Grecas inuenit unde dicitur Grecorum primus uestigat gramata Cadmus; litere Grece dentes serpentis dicuntur potiusquam alie quia astutiores et subtiliores sunt Greci quam alii, uel quia astutiores sunt homines poetice professionis quam laici uel propter satiricos qui mordaces sunt.

[7] De dentibus ergo id est de litteris nati sunt milites armati id est rethores qui contra aduersarios suos acsi armati sint configunt et misso lapide inter eos a Cadmo, id est questione aliqua, mutuo se occidunt id est mutuo sibi opposcentes et respondentes se confutant et confundunt. [8] Quinque tamen remanserunt quorum auxilio Cadmus urbem fundauit id est quinque uocales superstites fuerunt sine quibus nulla est dictio quorum auxilio fundatur omnis doctrina.

Apparatus Criticus Glosularum

1-46 *M PBWODA* 50-126 *M BWODA*

1. eam] puellam *W*
2. cretensia] *om. A* a...crete] *om. W* dictis] dicte *A*
13. inuenta] sic dicta *O: om. D* uel...adiutor *M BW: om. PODA*
15. castalis *MA*: castalo *O*: castalia (*W^r*) *D*: casta *P* et... dictus est *om. O* dictus est] denominatus *D*: dictus *A*
19. uel a nimpha *om. PA*
32. bellicosus *M BO P*: bellicosus *W^r D^rA*: uel bellicosus *W* uel marti sacratus *M PBO*: a marti consecratus *W^r*: marti consecratus *D*: uel marti consacratus *A* anguis...templorum] *om. A* aquarum] aque *O* draco] a raco *sic M* aeris] in aere (*B*)*O* et draco templorum *M*: tracho templi *sic W: om. PBOD* id est cristis aureis *W^r* lucidis] lucidam *A* et est endiadis *M BW: om. OA*: aureis et est ibi endiadis *ante* id est cristis *D*

44. quanto...potest] *om.* ODA arthos W: ortos MB pro-
tenditur BW: pertenditur M
46. *om.* OD phenicas M P: phenicos B: pheni. W: phenices
A querenda] querendam M: perdita P thebas] ath-
enas W^c: athenis W^{ac} isti M: iste B: ili W: illi A: qui P
quam...inuenerunt] *om.* P dicti sunt] aque sunt *sic* W
postea mutata] posita mutatum *sic* A causa breuitatis
MA: breuitatis causa BW
50. *om.* WO: *hic desinit* P
52. eorum] annorum *sic* O eorum sequitur uestigia M
55. *om.* W a leto] *om.* DA
64. qua] que D uicerat DA: uincat M: superauit B(W):
uincerat *sic* O
72. *om.* WOA id est sibi domesticas (B^c) de uulnere dicit
super causa recens (*lin.* 73) B^cD^c
74. *om.* OA idem quod alba M: alba W: est idem quod alba
D
75. *om.* WO a rado (d)is] *om.* A
77. ad idem M DA: ad eundem BWO
79. nec plus] *om.* BW: et non plus O: nec tamen plus D: nec
plus tamen A rite ritu M: *om.* BWODA

88. in profundo locum tenere *M*: in profunde ire *sic B*: profundam esse *WD*

92. *om. WO*

105. *om. WO* uel...procreati *om. DA* sunt procreati *M*: intercreati sunt *B*

126. *glossam super uirorum (lin. 110) ponit B* cromis] heronius *D* uel...dicunt *MBW: om. ODA*

Apparatus Criticus Mutationum et Allegoriarum

MV BPW

1. huius] tertii *V* armatos milites *M*

2. modo exponamus *V*: modo exponamus quasdam allegorice quasdam moraliter quasdam historice *P: om. BW* ea] illa *W* dicta] dicitur *W* regio *post* phene/icia *add. W* -que *V*: et *B* sue *om. V*

3. cadmus *om. PB* in reuera *W* deuenit *MV*: de fenicia ueniens *PBW* homines uentri pascendo tantum erant *PW* pascendo] parendo *B*

4. ergo *om. MV* suos *om. WP* uiuidi *V BW*: uiui *P: om. M* sibi haurirent *M* sua facundia *PW* eodem *PBW* occisi *PBW* confutauerunt] argumentando deuicerunt *W*

5. ferens *MVB*: gerens *PW* facundia et sapientia *MVB*: -iam et -iam *PW* munitus *MVB*: comitatus *(P)W* inpellens *MV* *B*: ex- *(P)W* utilitatis *MV*: subilitatis uel utilitatis dei *P*:

subtilitatis *B*: utilitatis uel subtilitatis *W* indigenarum]
om. B nocuit *MV*: nocere potuit *PBW*

6. theodorus *post* unde *add. W* grece] igitur *B* dicuntur]
dicte sunt *BW* potiusquam *V P*: magis quam *W*: potius
M: potius grece quam alie *B* sunt *MV*: fuerunt *B* sunt
greci et subtiliores *P*: fuerunt g. e. s. *W* la(i/y)ci] alii
scilicet laici *B*

7. ergo *om. MV* lit(t)eris] literis grecis *V* armatos milites *M*
sint] essent *BW* aliqua *M W*: ita *V*: *om. PB* mutuo] a
mutuo *P*: mutua *W* occidunt] concidunt *B* id est] *om.*
PBW sibi mutuo sibi *M*: sibi *V*: mutuo *PB*: mutuando *W*
et confundunt *om. M*

8. quinque] sex *M* urbem] suam ciuitatem *V* fundauit]
conposuit composuit *dupliciter sic V* uocalis *V* nulla
dicto est *M* cadmus fundatur *sic V*

Apparatus Fontium Glosularum

13. *cf. Mythog. I*; *cf. Ps.-Lact. Narr.3.fab.1*; 44. *cf. Serv. In Aen.11.661*; 46. *cf. Mythog. I.145*; *cf. Mythog. II.98*; *cf. Prisc. II.21.1, 11.40.7*; 126. *cf. Mythog. II.76*

Apparatus Fontium Allegoriarum

1. *cf. Isid. Etym.1.3.4-6*; *cf. Ps.-Lact. Narr.3.fab.1*; 3. *cf. Isid. Etym. 3.3-6, Sent. 2.46.2*; *cf. Sal.Cat.2.7-9*; 5. *cf. Isid. Sent.3.14.6*; 6 *cf. Theod. Ecl.133*

Bibliography

- Anderson, W.S., *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Books 1-5* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997)
- Ballistreri, G., 'Le *Allegoriae* ovidiane e Giovanni del Virgilio', in N. Barbu et al., *Acta Conventus Omnium Gentium Ovidianis Studiis Fovendis* (Bucharest: Bucharest University Press, 1976), 110-3
- Born, L.K., 'Ovid and Allegory', *Speculum* 9 (1934): 362-79
- Burton, R.J., *Classical Authors in the Florilegium Gallicum and Related Manuscripts*, Thesis (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1983)
- Cecchini, E., ed., *Uguccione da Pisa Derivationes*, 2 vols. (Florence: SIS-MEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004)
- Coulson, F.T., and B. Roy, *Incipitarium Ovidianum: A Finding Guide for Texts Related to the Study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000)
- , 'The Vulgate Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses', *Mediaevalia* 13 (1987): 29-61
- , *The 'Vulgate' Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Creation Myth and the Story of Orpheus* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1991)
- , 'Addenda and Corrigenda to Incipitarium Ovidianum', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 12 (2002): 154-80
- , 'Addenda and Corrigenda to Incipitarium Ovidianum (II)', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 19 (2009): 88-105
- , 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the School Tradition of France 1180-1400: Texts, Manuscript Traditions, Manuscript Settings', in J.G. Clark et al., eds., *Ovid in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 48-82
- , 'Reading the Classics in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: New Manuscript Discoveries', in N. van Deusen, ed., *Cicero Refused to Die: Ciceronian Influence through the Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 21-38
- , and K. Nawotka, 'The Rediscovery of Arnulf of Orléans' Glosses to Ovid's Creation Myth', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 44 (1993): 267-99

- , and U. Molyviati-Toptsis, 'Vaticanus Latinus 2877: A Hitherto Unedited Allegorization of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 2 (1992): 134-202
- Derolez, A., *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books from the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Engelbrecht, W., ed., *Filologie in de Dertiende Eeuw: De Bursarii Super Ovidios van Magister Willem van Orleans, Deel 2-Teksteditie* (Olmouc: Nakladestelsvi University Palackeho, 2003)
- , 'Carmina Pieridum multo vigilata laborel exponi, nulla certius urbe reor: Orléans and the Reception of Ovid in the Aetas Ovidiana in School Commentaries', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 41 (2006): 210-26
- , 'Fulco, Arnulf, and William: Twelfth-Century Views on Ovid in Orléans', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 18 (2006): 52-73
- Ghisalberti, F., 'Arnolfo d'Orleans: un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII', *Memorie del R. Istituto Lombardo, Classe Lettere* 24 (1932): 157-234
- , ed., *Giovanni di Garlandia: 'Integumenta Ovidii', Poemetto inedito del secolo XIII* (Messina-Milan: Principato, 1933)
- , 'Giovanni del Virgilio, espositore delle *Metamorfosi*', *Giornale dantesco* 34:4 (1933): 1-110
- , 'L'Ovidius moralizatus di Pierre Bersuire', *Studi romanzi* 23 (1933): 6-136
- Gura, D.T., 'A Critical Edition and Study of Arnulf of Orléans' Philological Commentary to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis (The Ohio State University, 2010)
- , 'From the *Orléanais* to Pistoia: The Survival of the Catena Commentary', *Manuscripta* 54 (2010): 171-88
- Hardie, P., 'Ovid's Theban History: The First "Anti-Aenied"?', *The Classical Quarterly* 40 (1990): 224-35
- Hexter, R., 'Medieval Articulations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: From Lactantian Segmentation to Arnulfian Allegory', *Mediaevalia* 13 (1987): 63-82

- , 'The Allegari of Pierre Bersuire: Interpretation and the Reductorium morale', *Allegorica* 10 (1989): 51-84
- Holzworth, J., 'Hugutio's *Derivationes* and Arnulfus' Commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 73 (1942): 259-76
- Janan, M., *Reflections in a Serpent's Eye: Thebes in Ovid's 'Metamorphoses'* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Keith, A., and S. Rupp, eds., *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007)
- Kwakkel, E., 'Biting, Kissing and the Treatment of Feet: The Transitional Script of the Long Twelfth Century', in E. Kwakkel et al., eds., *Turning Over a New Leaf: Change and Development in the Medieval Book* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2012), 79-125
- Marti, B.M., ed., *Arnulfus Aurelianus, Glosule super Lucanum* (Rome: American Academy, 1958)
- Pernot, L., trans. W.E. Higgins, *Rhetoric in Antiquity* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005)
- Reynolds, L.D., ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)
- Richter, Johannes, *Prolegomena zue einer Ausgabe des Palpanista Bernhards von der Geist*, Ph.D. Thesis (Königlichen Universität zu Münster, 1905)
- Rieker, J.R., ed., *Arnulfi Aurelianus Glosule Ovidii Fastorum* (Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2005)
- Rizzo, S., 'Due note sulla commedia elegiaca medievale, II: A proposito di Pamphilus in una glossa di Arnolfo d'Orleans', *Giornale italiano di filologia* 31 (1979): 97-103
- Robinson, M., review of Janan, *Reflections in a Serpent's Eye*, in *Journal of Roman Studies* 102 (2012): 385-6
- Roy, B., 'Arnulf of Orléans and the Latin "Comedy"', *Speculum* 49 (1974): 258-66

- , and H.V. Shooner, 'Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule de Remediis amoris', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 6 (1996): 135-96
- Rouse, R.H., 'Florilegia and Latin Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans', *Viator* 10 (1979): 131-60
- Rouse, M.A., and R.H. Rouse, *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 101-52
- Shooner, H.V., 'Les *Bursarii Ovidianorum* de Guillaume d'Orléans', *Medieval Studies* 43 (1981): 405-24
- Suchomski, J., *Lateinische Comediae des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979)
- Tarrant, R.J., ed., *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- Ward, J.O., 'From Marginal Gloss to Catena Commentary: The Eleventh-Century Origins of a Rhetorical Teaching Tradition in the Medieval West', *Parergon* 13 (1996): 109-20
- Waille, M-C., ed., *Le Palpanista de Bernard von der Geist*, 2 vols., Thesis (Paris: École nationale des chartes, 1992)
- Zeeman, N., 'In the Schoolroom with the "Vulgate" Commentary on *Metamorphoses* I', *New Medieval Literatures* 11 (2009): 1-18
- Ziolkowski, J.M., 'Mastering Authors and Authorizing Masters in the Long Twelfth Century', in W. Verbaal et al., eds., *Latinitas Perennis: Volume I: The Continuity of Latin Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 93-118
- , 'Cultures of Authority in the Long Twelfth Century', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 108 (2009): 421-8

tione collegi stricte tam additis etiam
his. que in principum uita egregia
exceperunt. ut tranquillitatis tue pos-
sit mens diuina letari prius se illus-
trium uirorum facta in administrazio
impio secutam. quam cognosceret
lectione. **INCIPIT LIBER. I. PAULI
PAULI. EUTROPII DE GESTIS ROMAN.**



que ex eius nomine saturnia dicta
est. cuius rursus hactenus cernunt
in finibus tuscie. haud procul ab urbe.

Hic saturnus quia italica latuit.
ab eius latebra latum appellata ē.

Ipse & enim adhuc rudes populos.
domus edificare. terras incolere.
plantare uineas docuit. atq; huma-
nis moribus uiuere. cū antea semi-
feris glandium tantum modo ali-
mentis uitam sustentarent. & aut

tertio anno
seccantur.
cēcē d. ant
cēcē iiii. an
annis. cēcē
geneas uene
uenit. anno
cū turno d
micant. eun
laumam. la
gium accep
mum oppid
appellauit.
annis tribu
regnum sus
eiusdem ex
ex creusa co
initalia uen
canus de rel
regno. alban
um postum
nia filium. i
Deinde as
uit. a quo fa
Paruuli
idoneus era

William of Malmesbury and the Classics: New Evidence

Rodney Thomson

The English Benedictine monk William of Malmesbury (c. 1090 – c. 1143) has a well-established reputation as one of England's greatest historians and also as a considerable classicist.¹ Recent research has, if anything, increased his stature as a reader, editor, and interpreter of ancient Latin literature. This paper will present some findings of this research under three heads.

1. Quotations from Unusual texts in unlikely places

I begin with new identifications of unusual Latin classical texts known to him, and used by him in unlikely contexts. The first of these is a long passage in his Commentary on Lamentations,² echoing and adapting a non-Christian writer, Apuleius (AD 125 – 180), in his *De deo Socratis*.

(*Comm. Lam.* 1. 1950-57) Quid est enim in homine suum, quid non alienum? Si dicis quod generosus est, parentes laudas. Diues est: non credo fortunae. Validus est: egritudine fatigabitur. Pernix est: abit in senectutem. Formosus est: expecta paulisper, et non erit. Magis aeternam Dei queramus gratiam, quae nos numquam derelinquat, quae non sit a patre hereditaria nec a casu pendula nec caduca corpore nec mutabilis aetate.

Much of this essay is 'borrowed plumage'. I wish to record my gratitude to Tina Chronopoulos, Robert Kaster, Ermanno Malaspina, Michael Reeve, and Michael Winterbottom, for discussing with me their research as outlined below. Their affable and generous sharing of information has made 'networking' with them a real pleasure. Kaster and Malaspina were also kind enough to read drafts of this paper.

1. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, including the most recent list of authors and works known to William at first hand (202-14). For corrections and modifications, see the Appendix below. Also cited in this article are William's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* and *Gesta Pontificum*

Anglorum (henceforward *GR* and *GP*).

2. *Willelmi Meldunensis monachi Liber super Explanationem Lamentationum Ieremiae Prophetae*, ed. Winterbottom and Thomson, henceforward *Comm. Lam.*

3. Translation by M. Winterbottom.

4. Verbal correspondences with William are signalled by italics.

What is there in a man that is his own, and not another's? If you say that he is well born, you are praising his parents. He is rich: I do not trust fortune. He is strong: he will be worn down by illness. He is swift: he is on the way to old age. He is handsome: wait a little while, and he will not be. Let us instead seek for the eternal grace of God, which never forsakes us, which is not inherited from one's father, not dependent on chance, or fleeting because it is bodily, or mutable because it is subject to ageing.³

(Apuleius, *De deo Socratis* 23)⁴ Similiter igitur et in hominibus contemplandis noli illa aliena aestimare, sed ipsum hominem penitus considera, ipsum ut meum Socratem pauperem specta. Aliena autem voco, quae parentes pepererunt et quae fortuna largita est. Quorum nihil laudibus Socratis mei admisceo, nullam generositatem, nullam prosapiam, nullos longos natales, nullas invidiosas divitias. Haec enim cuncta, ut dico, aliena sunt. Sat Parthaonio gloriae est, qui talis fuit, ut eius nepotem non puderet. Igitur omnia similiter aliena numeres licebit; *'generosus est': parentes laudas*. *'Dives est': non credo fortunae*. Nec magis ista adnumero: *'validus est': aegritudine fatigabitur*. *'Pernix est': stabit in senectute*. *'Formosus est': exspecta paulisper et non erit*. 'At enim bonis artibus doctus et adprime est eruditus et, quantum licet homini, sapiens et boni consultus': tandem aliquando ipsum virum laudas. Hoc enim nec a patre hereditarium est nec a casu pendulum nec a suffragio anniculum nec a corpore caducum nec ab aetate mutabile.

My second example is another long passage, expanded from Ausonius (AD c. 310 – 395), *Ephem.* 3, in the epilogue to William's *De miraculis beatae uirginis Mariae*.⁵

Numquam in securitatem resoluar, quod est inertis et negligētis in Deum animi, sed quasi semper in pro-cinctu stantem sensum alta formido de preteritis commissis exagitet, cautela de instantibus sollicitet; dolor penitentiae tormenta Gehennae anticipet. Nil fatiam, queso, unde iure doleam, nil cupiam unde male gaudeam. Non ipse sim michi causa pudoris, agens quod egisse pigeat, committens quod commisisse peniteat. Sin uero prolapsus fuero, non uolutabrum foueam, sed cito resurgam. Non ledar apud Deum crimine uero, nec apud homines infamer falso. Vtrumque bono uiro cauendum, ne sit uel falso suspectus nec uere reus. Quietis et tranquillis motibus agatur haec materies corporis, nec compago caelestis et terreni dissideant. Nulla umquam sui parte sautius quicquam amissum desideret carnis usus, ut spe liberiore in alta contendat. Sotialem uitam diligens, amicos qui michi fidelitate conquadrent habeam. Nulla eos mea offensa aliquando effuget, sed mutua inter nos et pari lance caritas certet. Quod necesse est et expedit, assequar. Quod superfluit non ambiam. Nec me angustet inopia nec dissoluat copia. Sed postremo uiuam ut supremæ horæ pressus articulo, mente boni conscia, nec propter peccata mori metuam nec propter importunitatem aliquarum erumnarum appetam. Nec mortem expauescam nec uitam erubescam. Munus hoc Dei, sicut sine iussu non abrumpendum, ita cum iusserit non subterfugiendum. Haec pia liba, haec bona uota, sed pro conscientia pec-

5. Henceforward *Mir. BVM*, ed. Canal, *El Libro 'De laudibus et miraculis sanctae Mariae' de Guillermo de Malmesbury*, not identifying the echoes of Ausonius. A new edition and translation by M. Winterbottom and R.M. Thomson will shortly be published by Boydell & Brewer.

catorum trepida, o domina, o benigna, fer filio tuo, asserere Iudici nostro. Et ut ratae sint orationes, solidae preces, orna me uirtutibus tuis, impertiens michi re cognomina tuae dignitatis quae et sanxit antiquitas et rerum commendat ueritas.

May I never relax into complacency, the sign of a lazy mind negligent towards God, but may my conscious self always be as it were in battle order, harassed by deep fears about past sins, troubled by misgivings about ones to come. May the pains of penitence anticipate the torments of hell. May I do nothing, I beg, to make me grieve for a good reason, desire nothing to make me rejoice for a bad one. May I not be a cause of shame to myself by doing what I regret having done, committing what I repent having committed. But if I do fall, may I not go on wallowing in sin, but rise again swiftly. May I not be arraigned in God's eyes on a true charge, or defamed among men on a false one. Both things must be guarded against by a good man, either to be suspected falsely or to be found guilty on a true charge. May this material that makes up the body be quiet and untroubled in its movements, let there be no dissonance between the material of heavenly and earthly. May the flesh whose services I enjoy be wounded in no part of itself, miss nothing that it has lost, so that it may hasten above with freer hope. I love a life shared with others; may I have friends who are loyal to me as I am to them. May no cause for offence in me ever drive them away, but let the affection between us always compete on equal terms. May I attain what is necessary and expedient. May I not strive for

what is excessive. May I not be straitened by poverty or enervated by abundance. Lastly, may I live in such a way that at the point of death I have a clear conscience, and do not either fear to die because of my sins or seek to die because some importunate misfortune presses upon me. May I not be frightened to die or ashamed to live. This gift from God should not be cut short without an order, but one must not skulk when He does give the order. These pious offerings, these good prayers, though they are timid because I know I have sinned, Lady, kind Lady, bring to your Son, and defend them to our Judge. And so that my prayers may have validity and weight, deck me out with your virtues, granting me the...⁶ of your dignity which antiquity has hallowed and the truth of things commends.⁷

6. The word, *recognomina*, is not otherwise attested.

7. Translation by M. Winterbottom.

8. Verbal correspondences with William are signalled by italics.

(Ausonius, *Ephem.* 3: 54-64)⁸ Tacitum si paenitet *altaque sensus / formido* excruciat *tormenta*que sera *gehen-nae anticipat* patiturque suos mens saucia manes. Da, pater, haec nostro fieri *rata* uota precatu. / nil metuum *cupiamque* nihil; satis hoc rear esse, / quod satis est. nil turpe uelim nec *causa pudoris / sim mihi*. nec uero *crimine laedar / nec* maculer dubio; paulum distare uidetur / *suspectus uereque reus*. ... (66) *sim carus amicis* ... (68-70) non animo doleam, non corpore; cuncta *quietis / fungantur* membra officiis; nec *saucius* ullis / *partibus amissum quicquam desideret usus*. ... (72) *suprema diei cum uenerit hora, nec timeat mortem bene conscia* uita nec optet. ... (79-80) haec pia, sed maesto *trepidantia* uota reatu, nate, apud aeternum placabilis *assere* patrem.

9. *GR* 2. 4 and 3. 3;
Comm. Lam., p. 18.

10. Chronopoulos,
'Brief Lives'. What
follows is largely dependent upon Chronopoulos' discussion.

11. BL, Royal 4 B. iv (c. 1150, Worcester); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 202 (c. 1150–1175, Gloucester); BnF, lat. 5839 (c. 1150–1175, Winchcombe?).

12. BnF, lat. 2781 and lat. 8559.

William was clearly attracted by Ausonius' poem, quoting shorter passages from it in *GR* and *Comm. Lam.*⁹ It is remarkable that these ancient texts should have been used, and to such an extent, in a biblical commentary and a set of *miracula*. Both passages show that William had mastered these texts, to the extent that he could interweave them with his own prose, using or adapting their wording as he thought appropriate.

2. William as Possible Author of Learned Introductions to Some Ancient Texts

I turn next to a set of short bio-bibliographical texts about the lives and works of three late-antique authors, Sidonius Apollinaris (AD 430 – 489), Quintus Aurelius Symmachus (c. 345 – 402) and Fulgentius Mythographus (c. 500), recently edited and attributed to William's authorship.¹⁰ They survive in five copies, three of them twelfth-century and from monastic communities in south-west England: Worcester, Gloucester, and perhaps Winchcombe.¹¹ The other two copies are French, dated to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.¹² The notes were clearly meant to preface texts of the relevant authors and most of them still do: all the extant copies contain the text of Symmachus and some of Sidonius as well, though in all but one case the notes are an informal addition. They are in the tradition of Jerome's *De viris illustribus*, a text well known in the twelfth century, giving the author's name, origin and dates, with the titles of his works and short summaries of their content. In addition, dates and names of relevant emperors or consuls are supplied to produce a historical framework. This is supplemented by relevant citations from a wide variety of sources: Sidonius' letters, *carmina* and *panegyrici*, Ambrose's letters, Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, Prudentius' *Contra*

Symmachum, Cassiodorus' *Historia tripartita*, Jordanes' *Romana* and *Getica*, Paul the Deacon's *Historia romana*, Gregory of Tours' *Historia Francorum*, and something called 'leges romanae'. The note on Fulgentius Mythographus is particularly impressive in listing all his known works, while avoiding confusion with those of the far better-known Christian writer Fulgentius bishop of Ruspe.¹³

William's name does not appear in any of the copies, but there are many pointers suggesting his authorship.¹⁴ The provenance of the earliest manuscripts brings us at once into his *Kulturkreis*. He knew most if not all of the texts involved, including some, like Jordanes, that were scarce. One of the manuscripts copied by William and his assistants, Bodleian, Arch. Seld. B. 16, is of particular relevance.¹⁵ Among its edited and excerpted chronicles of imperial history from Troy until the ninth century we find Paul the Deacon and both works of Jordanes. The 'leges romanae' are at present a mystery, not least because they are quoted as evidence that persons named Symmachus and Probus were joint consuls in the reign of Constantine the Great, which they were not. One suspects that the error lurks in another part of the Selden MS, William's copy of the version of the Theodosian Code known as the *Breviarium Alaricum*, but neither Tina Chronopoulos nor I have been able to find it there. Finally, William definitely wrote notes of similar character as prefaces to his own copies of ancient texts.¹⁶

3. William as Editor of Ancient Texts

In third place, I wish to present some examples of ancient texts thought to have been edited or commented on by William: these comprise Pliny's *Natural History*, Suetonius' *De uita Caesarum*, and Cicero's *Lucullus*, as discussed by

13. They may or may not have been the same person: Chronopoulos, 'Brief Lives', 257-9.

14. Discussed by Chronopoulos, 'Brief Lives', 272-5.

15. Chronopoulos, 'Brief Lives', 272-4; Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, 63-4, 66-7, 90-1 etc.

16. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, 16-17, 23-4, 51-3, 61, 63, 66-7.

17. William of Malmesbury, *Polyhistor*, 37, line 30-38, line 23.

18. Reeve, 'The Editing of Pliny's Natural History', 133, 155-6; also Borst, *Das Buch der Naturgeschichte*, at 251-4.

Michael Reeve, Robert Kaster, and Ermanno Malaspina respectively.

Michael Reeve has drawn attention to a two-volume copy of Pliny, BAV, Ottob. lat. 1302 + 1459 (English?, thirteenth-century, once containing the text to 37. 199). Textually, it is a representative of a mainly English family descended from BnF, lat. 6795 (850-900). The main scribe wrote gothic bookhand of international type, impossible to particularize geographically. But in the margin of MS 1302, fol. 29, we find the word 'Britannia', and at fol. 79 'Delphinus Anglice mereswin Gallice porpeis'. Reeve drew attention to marginal notes summarizing the contents of each chapter, which break off at bk. 32. 142. They are in the hand of the main text and their errors indicate that they were copied from the exemplar. One marginal note a little more ambitious than the rest is in MS 1302, fol. 42v: '[Nota] quod Cicero dixit hec fecisse Zeusin apud Crotoniatas non apud Agrigentinos' (*De inv.* 2. 103). William cited Cicero's version of the story in his florilegium, the *Polyhistor*.¹⁷ In the same work he copied extracts from Pliny as far as 32. 142.¹⁸ The fact that his extracts and the marginal notes in the Vatican Pliny terminate at the same point seems more than coincidental.

In November 2012 I was contacted by Prof. Robert Kaster, who is editing Suetonius' *De uita Caesarum* for the series Oxford Classical Texts. What he had to say, of two manuscripts never before used by Suetonius' editors, is of enormous interest and significance on several counts:

One pair of 'twins' has been especially interesting – though they have been all but ignored till now – because they clearly bear the imprint of a very distinctive reader in their common background: together they

share some 2000 unique errors (a number completely without parallel in the other MSS), and while some of these are of the run-of-the-mill sort, it is clear that most are the work of someone who had firm and systematic ideas about how the Latin ought to work, and no compunction whatever about changing what Suetonius wrote to make the Latin work that way.... So in that respect the text that these two books preserve is a sorry piece of work, from a modern editor's point of view. But: along with those hundreds upon hundreds of willful and transgressive tinkers, there are fifty corrections that are unquestionably correct, often very learned and even brilliant, and in most cases surfacing in these books centuries before they are otherwise attested. To put the number of these gems in perspective, they come to half a dozen more good emendations than can be credited to Erasmus, Salmasius, Turnebus, Lipsius, Casaubon, and Bentley – combined. One of the manuscripts in question is a thirteenth-century manuscript now in the British Library (BL, Royal 15 C. iv). The other is... Bodleian, Lat. class. d. 39, c. 1175.¹⁹

19. Email of 15 November, 2012. See also Kaster's forthcoming papers, 'Making Sense of Suetonius in the Twelfth Century', and 'The Transmission of Suetonius' *Caesars* in the Middle Ages'.

20. 'William of Malmesbury's Carolingian Sources', revised version in Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, 137-53.

What made Kaster think of William? One reason, as with the bio-bibliographical notes, was the provenance of the surviving copies. The original home of BL, Royal 15 C. iv has not been identified, but at least it is known to have come from south-west England. The Bodleian MS, a cento of historical texts focusing upon ninth-century Francia, was probably made and kept at Christ Church Canterbury, but copied from an exemplar put together and annotated by William, as I showed some years ago.²⁰ The copy of Suetonius in it, then, at the very least passed through William's hands. If he did not edit this copy,

21. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, chapter 8.

22. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, 51–5.

23. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, 52.

24. A group of young scholars under the direction of Ermanno Malaspina is currently working on the other Ciceronian works in St Omer, BM, 652 (*Philippics*, *Tusculans*, *De natura deorum*, *De divinatione*, *De fato*, *Ti-maeus*) and on its text of Apuleius' *Asclepius*, with the aim of producing a systematic overview of the MS, its position in relation to CUL, Mm. 13. 2, and the kind of interventions by William; Malaspina hopes to submit a collective paper for publication before the end of 2014.

25. 'Di fronte a un *modus operandi* così sistematicamente intrusivo e coraggiosamente congetturale, viene da pensare che persino le numerose inversioni di **m**...non siano, come spesso succede, sviste inconse, ma deliberati adattamenti a un *cursus* o a un *ordo verborum* ritenuti più corretti o eleganti'. I quote from Malaspina's forthcoming

then the editing was done by someone at much the same time and in the same region. Another reason is that two of William's quotations from Suetonius in *GR* share unique readings with the common ancestor of Kaster's 'twins'. Yet another is that the kinds of emendation practiced on this ancestor are very similar to the ways in which William edited the text of Alcuin's letters, quoted by him in *GR* and *GP*.²¹

Thirdly, there is the recent discovery, by Ermanno Malaspina of the University of Torino, of a second copy of William's collection of Cicero's philosophical works (a representative of the so-called 'Leiden corpus'). Until this point, the collection had been known only from the fifteenth-century CUL, Mm. 13. 2, copied for William Gray, bishop of Ely, by the Flemish or German scribe Thomas Werken.²² It is famous for the long note in which 'Ego Willelmus Malmesburiensis' attempts to justify his love of the Latin classics.²³ The new discovery, St Omer, BM, 652, also from the fifteenth century, bears the *ex libris* of the abbey of St Bertin, where it was doubtless made. Collation shows that the two MSS are gemelli, that is, copied from the same (lost) exemplar. This exemplar (**m**), was of course William's copy and having two direct descendants of it means that it is now possible to say something about the readings of the texts which they have in common and which derive from **m**. Malaspina has shown that, for the *Lucullus* at least,²⁴ the situation is very similar to that of the Suetonius exemplar: **m** contained aggressive, unauthoritative textual emendations by a master of Latin, among them some excellent readings anticipating guesses made centuries later by respected classical scholars.²⁵

Sections 2 and 3 (above), in neither of which is William's involvement proven to the hilt, leave us with a problem: Should we see William as a one-man-band, or have we

to do with a learned culture involving several individuals and places? I take the liberty of quoting Robert Kaster again, this time with reference to Macrobius' *Saturnalia*:

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 71 (C), written at St. Albans in s. XII med. 3/4, is the earliest source of a couple of dozen emendations that all of Macrobius' modern editors have put in the text, though they've all been attributed to later sources because no editor since Gronovius used the MS. Both the successful emendations and the 'nice tries' are all pretty clearly the product of the same mind, though all we can say about it is that it was active in England sometime before C itself was written and sometime after the writing of the ancestor that C has in common with its twin, a slightly earlier Cambridge manuscript (CUL, Ff. 3. 5, s. XII 2/4, Bury St. Edmunds = A), which shares hundreds of errors with C but lacks these corrections.²⁶

ing article 'La tradizione manoscritta del *Lucullus* di Cicerone'.

26. Email of 20 November, 2012. Detail in Kaster, *Studies on the Text of Macrobius' Saturnalia*, 18-27.

Given the provenance of these manuscripts, there would seem no particular reason to identify this particular corrector with William, unless we are prepared to concede that he was the only Englishman living in the first half of the twelfth century capable of editing to such a standard. This may not be unreasonable. On the other hand, if we have to do with a scenario involving more than one person, what might that scenario have been? The evidence advanced above suggests a milieu focused on the larger Benedictine communities in southern England. This, however, even if true in itself, may not be the whole picture, for similar evidence may yet be sought for and found in other places, northern England or the Continent.

Whatever the case, these achievements, major features of the 'twelfth-century renaissance', represent a high-water

27. As is the practice of all three classicists mentioned above under 3. Another example is the text of Cicero's *De officiis*, ed. Winterbottom, the surviving MSS listed by him in *Classical Quarterly* ser. nov. 43 (1993): 215-42.

28. None of the reminiscences (mainly of patristic sources) identified, mainly by Michael Winterbottom, in *Comm. Lam.* are quoted verbatim or named by William. Whether he was using the identified source at first hand is very much a matter of judgement (mine in this instance), and complete certainty is often not possible.

mark in the editing of classical texts not again attained until the sixteenth century. More generally still, these examples show that medieval scholars could make conjectural emendations to their texts that were just as plausible and intelligent as those made by the 'great names' in classical studies of the sixteenth century and beyond. This is a point still too lightly regarded by modern editors of the same texts; the ability, conferred by digital technology, to identify and access all the surviving manuscripts of a particular text, should correct this situation so long as all of the survivors are adequately collated and their interrelationships established.²⁷

Appendix

Additions and corrections to the list of William's reading in my *William of Malmesbury*, 202-14.

AGOBARD, *Aduersus legem Gundobadi*: *Comm. Lam.*, p. 77.²⁸

AMBROSE, *Apologia David*: *Comm. Lam.*, p. 102; *De fide*: *Comm. Lam.*, p. 257; *In Lucam*: *Comm. Lam.*, pp. 100, 165; *In Ps. XII*: *Comm. Lam.*, pp. 6, 234, 298.

AMBROSIUS AUTPERTUS, *In Apoc.*: *Comm. Lam.*, pp. 150, 195, 226, 313.

ANSELM: delete *Unde Malum*, an extract from letter 97; add *De Casu Diaboli*: in William's collection of Anselmiana, London, Lambeth Palace Library, 224.

APPONIUS, *In Cant.*: *Comm. Lam.*, pp. 44, 45, 53 etc. A very rare work, known to Bede and Angelomus of Luxeuil, but to few others.

APULEIUS, *De deo Socratis*: now certain; see above, p. 169-70.

AUGUSTINE, *De catechizandis rudibus*: *Comm. Lam.*, p. 214; *De musica*: *Comm. Lam.*, p. 30; *Quaestiones in Matt.*: *Comm. Lam.*, p. 49.

Ps.-AUGUSTINE, *De assumptione beatae Mariae* (PL 40. 1141-8). *Mir. BVM*, prol. etc.

Ps.-AURELIUS VICTOR, *Epitome*: *Comm. Lam.*, pp. 260-1.

BEDE, *Homiliae: Comm. Lam.*, p. 57; *In Epist. Catholicas: Comm. Lam.*, p. 111; *In Lucam: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 164, 210; *In Reg. Quaestiones: Comm. Lam.*, p. 282.

Ps.-BEDE, *In Ps.* (PL 93. 477-1098): *Comm. Lam.*, pp. 7, 9, 11, etc.

CAESARIUS OF ARLES, *Serm.* 3. 1, 179. 4: *Comm. Lam.*, pp. 97, 93.

CICERO, *Pro Cluentio*: see also *Comm. Lam.*?, p. 189.

Ps.-CIXILA, *Vita Ildefonsi* (BHL 3919; PL 96. 43-7): *Mir. BVM*, mir. 3.

CURTIUS RUFUS, *Gesta Alexandri: Comm. Lam.*, p. 90. William may have known this rare text in the interpolated form discussed by Smits, 'A medieval supplement to the beginning of Curtius Rufus' *Historia Alexandri*'. He noted (pp. 96-7) that at GR 3. 238 William recalled Suetonius, *Iul.* 59, followed by Justin 11. 6. 1, both quoted, in the same order, in the 'medieval supplement' at lines 315-16, 331-2. The earliest and best witness to the interpolated version of Curtius, Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 82, 1150-1175, has been thought to be French, but is written by an English scribe. Curtius also figures in the mid twelfth-century library catalogue of Bury St Edmunds Abbey.

EUSEBIUS-JEROME, *Chronicon*: Bodleian, Arch. Seld. b. 16, fol. 71r-v.

Ps.-EUTYCHIANUS, *Paenitentia Theophili*, tr. Paul the Deacon (AASS Feb. 1. 483-7): *Mir. BVM*, mir. 1.

FULBERT OF CHARTRES, *Homilia 'Approbatæ consuetudinis'*: *Mir. BVM*, prol. etc. This seems to have been the only homily by Fulbert known to William.

GAUDENTIUS, *Tractatus: Comm. Lam.*, p. 199. Fragments of a late eleventh-century English copy are in three printed books: Oxford, All Souls College, SR. 80. g. 8, Merton College, 2 f. 10, and Eton College, Ea. 3. 6: Thomson, *Merton*, p. 262.

GREGORY OF TOURS, *Libri X Historiarum*. The reference cited in my earlier list, *Comm. Lam.*, p. 241 'Leuare – erigere', attrib. Gregory the Great (*Epist. app.*, ed. D. Norberg, p. 1102 lines 19-21), is indeed found in 10, 1 (ed. Krusch, p. 479, 17-8): 'ad Deum quippe

- corda cum manibus leuare est orationis nostrae studium cum merito bonae operationis eregere'. But there is a separate additional tradition for this (see Krusch's note ad loc.). It is *cited* by Gregory of Tours, but as part of an 'oratio ad plebem' by Pope Gregory (who says something very similar in *Moral.* 18, 5). But see above, p. 175.
- HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS, *In Cant.: Comm. Lam.*, p. 263.
- ISIDORE, *Differentiae: Comm. Lam.*?, p. 229; *Sent.: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 41, 208.
- JEROME, *?Hebr. Quaest. in Gen.: Comm. Lam.*, p. 299; *In Ezech.: Comm. Lam.*, p. 300; *Commentarioli in Pss.: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 34, 115; *?Tract. in Pss.: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 23, 34, 190.
- Ps.-JEROME, *Breuiarium in Pss.: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 41, 120 etc.
- Ps.-JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum: Comm. Lam.*, p. 299. William is one of the earliest English quoters from the Latin version. It does not seem to have been known in Anglo-Saxon England.
- JOHN OF SALERNO, *Vita S. Odonis (PL 133. 71-2): Mir. BVM*, mir. 19.
- JUSTINIAN, *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. It is perhaps not very certain that William knew this. The passage quoted from William in *William of Malmesbury*, p. 63, was lifted by him verbatim from Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.* 1. 25, also used by Sigebert of Gembloux. The only argument for William knowing the Corpus is that he says it was far more extensive than the version of the Theodosian Code that he knew (the *Breviarium Alarici*).
- PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS, *In Matth.: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 132, 148 etc.
- PETER DAMIAN: Letter 132: apparently quoted in *Comm. Lam.*, p. 81.
- PROSPER, *Liber sententiarum: Comm. Lam.*, p. 76.
- PRUDENTIUS, *Cathemerinon*, now certain: *Comm. Lam.*, p. 180; *Hamar-tigenia: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 19, 23.
- RABANUS, *In Ierem.: Comm. Lam.*, p. 7; *In Ecclus: Comm. Lam.*, p. 9.
- ROBERT OF TOMBELAINE, *In Cant.* William's knowledge of this popular work was previously inferred from a brief notice of it in the

margin of Bodleian, Auct. F. 3. 14; in fact he used it extensively (without acknowledgement) as a source for *Comm. Lam.* (e.g. pp. 16, 26, 52).

RUPERT OF DEUTZ, *De Diuinis Officiis: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 92, 217; *De glorificatione Trinitatis: Comm. Lam.*, p. 150; *De Sancta Trinitate: Comm. Lam.*, pp. 93, 165, 246. Rupert's works would never be well known outside Germany. It is remarkable that William knew any of them; he seems to have travelled on the Continent as far as Aachen (*GP*, vol. 2, pp. 213-15) and perhaps found them there.

Ps.-SENECA, *Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam* (CPL 191). *Epistola ad Paulum* 11. 6 (ed. Barlow, p. 133) is quoted almost verbatim in *Comm. Lam.*, p. 84 'donec inuicta felicitas malis imponat finem' (Ps.-Seneca 'donec inuicta felicitas finem malis imponat').

SOPHRONIUS, *Vita S. Mariae Aegyptiaca*, tr. Paul the Deacon of Naples (*BHL* 5415; *PL* 73. 671-90): *Mir. BVM*, mir. 40.

SULPICIOUS SEVERUS, *Dialogi* (*BHL* 5614-16): *Mir. BVM*, mir. 39.

SYMMACHUS, *Relationes: Comm. Lam.*, p. 50. And see above, p. 174.

SYMPHOSIUS: *GP* 4. 196. 2 (and comm. ad loc.).

Bibliography

AASS *Acta Sanctorum*

BHL *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*

Borst, A., *Das Buch der Naturgeschichte: Plinius und seine Leser im Zeitalter des Pergaments* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1994)

Canal, J.M., ed., *El Libro 'De laudibus et miraculis sanctae Mariae' de Guillermo de Malmesbury, OSB († 1143)* (Rome: Alma Roma, 1968)

Chronopoulos, T., 'Brief Lives of Sidonius, Symmachus, and Fulgentius Written in Early Twelfth-Century England?', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 20 (2010): 232-91

Cicero, *De officiis*, ed. M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Kaster, R.A., 'Making Sense of Suetonius in the Twelfth Century', in A.

- Grafton and G. Most, eds., *How To Do Things With Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming)
- , *Studies on the Text of Macrobius' Saturnalia*, American Philological Association, American Classical Studies 55 (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- , 'The Transmission of Suetonius' *Caesars* in the Middle Ages', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (forthcoming)
- Malaspina, E., 'La tradizione manoscritta del *Lucullus* di Cicerone: dal *Corpus Leidense* a William of Malmesbury e alla fortuna in età umanistica', in M. Martinho and I. Tardin Cardoso, eds., *Ciceronianissimi II* (São Paulo, forthcoming [in Portuguese])
- Patrologia cursus completus, series latina* (abbreviated as *PL*), ed. J.P. Migne (Paris: Migne etc., 1884-65), available online as *Patrologia Latina: The Full Text Database* (Chadwyck Healy)
- Reeve, M., 'The Editing of Pliny's Natural History', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, New Series 2 (2007): 107-79
- Smits, E.R., 'A Medieval Supplement to the Beginning of Curtius Rufus' *Historia Alexandri: An Edition with Introduction*, *Viator* 18 (1987): 89-124
- Thomson, R.M., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Merton College, Oxford* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2009)
- , *William of Malmesbury*, 2nd edn. (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003)
- , 'William of Malmesbury's Carolingian Sources', *Journal of Medieval History* 7 (1981): 321-37
- William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, Vol. 1, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom and R.M. Thomson; Vol. 2, commentary by R.M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007)
- , *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, Vol. 1, ed. and trans. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom; Vol. 2, general introduction and commentary by R.M. Thomson (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1998-9)
- , *Polyhistor Defloratorium*, ed. H. Testroet Ouellete (Binghamton, NY:

Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University
of New York at Binghamton, 1982)

Winterbottom, M., and R.M. Thomson, eds., *Willelmi Meldunensis monachi Liber super Explanationem Lamentationum Ieremiae Prophetae*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 244 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011)

Notes on Contributors

Robert Gary Babcock is Professor of Classics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he teaches Medieval Latin, palaeography, and textual criticism. He was previously Curator of Early Books and Manuscripts at the Beinecke Library of Yale University. He is a fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung and a member of the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts. His research focuses on the transmission of the Latin classics in the Middle Ages and beyond; his latest book is *The Well-Laden Ship. Egbert of Liège*, *Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library* 25 (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2013).

David T. Gura is Curator of Ancient and Medieval Manuscripts, Early Imprints, and History of the Book at the University of Notre Dame, and concurrent assistant professor of the Medieval Institute, where he teaches Latin Palaeography. He has recently completed *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Manuscript Books of the University of Notre Dame and Saint Mary's College*.

Erik Kwakkel is Associate Professor in palaeography at Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society, Principal Investigator of the NWO-funded research project 'Turning Over a New Leaf: Manuscript Innovation in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', and a member of the Young Academy of the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). His publications include monographs on Carthusian book production (2002) and change and development in medieval

manuscripts (2012, co-authored with Rosamond McKitterick and Rodney Thomson); edited volumes on medieval authorship (2012, co-edited with Stephen Partridge) and Insular manuscript culture (2013); and articles and book chapters devoted to Middle Dutch and Latin manuscripts.

Irene O'Daly is a Research Associate at the John Rylands Research Institute, University of Manchester. Her research focuses on the history of political thought, medieval intellectual history, and the history of the book. She is writing a monograph on the reception of Roman philosophy in the political thought of John of Salisbury (*c.* 1120-80), and her current research concerns the use of diagrams in educational contexts in the Middle Ages, specifically for the teaching of Ciceronian rhetoric. She was formerly a post-doctoral researcher (2011-14) on the NWO-funded project 'Turning Over a New Leaf: Manuscript Innovation in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance'.

Mariken Teeuwen is senior researcher at Huygens ING, a research institute of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), and professor at the Department of History, University of Utrecht. She is Principal Investigator of the NWO-funded research project 'Marginal Scholarship: The Practice of Learning in the Early Middle Ages (*c.* 800-*c.* 1000)' and has published on the medieval reception of the ancient learned tradition, the vocabulary of intellectual life in the Middle Ages, and the annotation of books in the Carolingian period.

Rodney Thomson is Emeritus Professor of Medieval History at the University of Tasmania and Honorary Research Fellow in its School of History and Classics. He is a historian and palaeographer, whose research has focused on intellectual and cultural life in twelfth-century England, with special attention to Benedictine monasteries and men of learning, their books and libraries. Since the early 1980s he has produced a series of descriptive catalogues of the medieval manuscripts at Lincoln, Hereford and Worcester Cathedrals, Merton and Corpus Christi Colleges Oxford. He has also edited and translated medieval Latin texts, above all (with Michael Winterbottom) the historical works of the monk William of Malmesbury (d. *c.* 1142), and contributed to the history of the Latin classical tradition in Western Europe before *c.* 1500.

Colour Plates




Plate 1. Leiden,
Universiteits-
bibliotheek, VLF 30,
fol. 10r (detail)

MARTIANI MINELLI FELICIS CAPELLAE
AURI-CARTAGINIENSIS DE VITIIS PHILOLOGIAE LIBER
LIBER PRIMUS INCIPIT

[illegible]

ACADLYGD

Ex Bibliotheca Viri Illustris Isaaci Vossii. 64

Icosas furie iussu tendebat ad areses.
 Instabiles q. olim simplex adas. & freta remis.
 Iudicia thesauris. celsa qua bofforus urbe
 Splendet. & odrys sin. Afram discriminat horis.
 Ut longum pmentus iter. ductus q. maligno
 Stamine factorum. elaram subrepsit in aulam.
 Ilic & ambitio nasci. discedere rectum.
 Venium cuncta dari. profert arelana. diemtes
 Falla. & ambitos a principe uendit honores.
 Ingeminat crimen. commoti pectoris ignem
 Nunciat. & exiguum stimulando uulnus aceruat.
 Ale uelut innumeros annes accedere nereus
 Nescit. & undantem quimus hinc hauriat histri.
 Hinc bibit aestuum septeno gurgite nilum.
 Par semp. similis q. manet. sic fluctibus auri
 Expleri calor ille nequit. Cuiusq. mouile
 Contextum gemmis. aut preda culta fuissent.
 Rufino populandus erat. domino q. parabat
 Extremum secundus ager. metuenda colonis
 Fertilitas. laribus pellit. detrudit auitas
 Unibus. aut aufert iuuus. aut occupat heres.
 Congeste cumul. intur opes. orbis q. ruinas
 Accipit una domus. populi seruire coacti.
 Plenaq. priuato succumbunt oppida regno.
 Quo uetane ruit. tenues uterumq. licet
 Oceanium. laxet rutilos tibi lydia fontes.
 Iunguntur solum croesi. cyriq. turpe.
 Nunquam diues eris. nunqua satiare questu.
 Semper inops quicunq. cupit. Contentus honesto
 Fabricius paruo. spernit hinc munera regum.
 Sudabat q. graui consul serranus aratro.
 Et asi pugnaes curios angusta tenebat.
 Hec mihi paupertas opulentior. hec mihi recta

in insaniabilis
causas 2-

what you
my dear

Fabrij
vntas.

47
Composita diti
adip. p. auster
annul.

Culminibus maiora tuis: ibi quiescit uanesc
Luxuries nocturna cibos: hic donat inemptas
Terta dapet: rapiunt tyrios ibi uellera siccis:
Et piceatque fucantur murice uestes:
Hic radiant flores: & praeiunia uoluptas
In genio uariata suo: fulgentibus illis
Surgunt strata toris: hic mollis pandit herba
Sallituri curis non abruptura soporem:
Turba salutantium latasibi pstreptit aedes:
Hic auum cantus: labentes murmurant rui:
Vultus exiguus melius: Natura beatorum
Omnibus esse dedit: si quis cognouerit uti:
Haece si nota forent: frueremur simplice cultu:
Cassica non gemerent: non stridula fraginus ure:
Non uentus quateret puppes: non machina muros:
Cresceret scelera scitis: praedeq. recentis:
Incestus flagralat amor: nullusq. perendi
Cogendi ue pudor: crebris peritura neccit
Blanditus: sociat perituro foedere dectas:
Sic semel et tantis poscenti quisq. negasset:
Fstera praetumido quatrelat corda furore:
Quae sic getuli iaculo percussa laena:
Aut hyrcana prementis raptore belua parchi:
Aut serpens calcata fuit: laxata deorum
Maestas teritur: nusquam reuerentia mens:
Non coniunx: non ipse simul: non pignora cesti
Sufficiunt odus: non extinxisse propinquos:
Non notos egisse sat est: extinguere cives:
Et uidetur: & nomen gentis delet laborat:
Nec celeris ^{perunt} loeto: crudelibus ante
Supplicis fruitur: cruciatibus umela tenebras
Dilato mucrone parat: prohi. senior ense
Larcendi rabies: concessa q. uitae dolor:




Plate 6. Leiden,
Universiteits-
bibliotheek, VLQ 33,
fol. 56r (detail)





Plate 10. Leiden,
 Universiteits-
 bibliotheek, BPL 28,
 fol. 2v

74
sonder onderſcheit ghebruken weſele
der ſalechheit. **D**at ſalechheit es gods
allene weſeleec ende allen gheenten on
weſeleec. want gheen ghelezen we
ſen en mach niet gods weſene een
ſijn. ende te gude hem ſeluen. want
ſo wordt de creature god. dat omme
gheleec es. Want gods weſen en mach
menderen. noch meerren. **N**och heime
en mach niet met auegaen noch we
gaen. **N**och ſijn alle minde gheeste
en ghebruken. en ene ſalechheit niet
god ſonder differentie. want dat ſale
che weſen. **D**at gods ghebruken
es. en alle liere gheminder. dat es
alre tempel eenuordich. dat daer
en es. noch vader. noch ſon
noch heileghe geest. en niet her
na ploentelſe onder. en niet allen
ſoed. noch gheue wijs. dat ic vore
creature. naer robe. en deſe enighe
alle die vader gheen. en gheuen t

Plate 12. Brussels,
Bibliothèque royale de
Belgique, 3067-73, fol.
74r (120% of true size)

133
 reserant occiduo .i. fine. Titulo .i. sepulchro. crepundia .i. cornuta
 sola .i. puellula. Spernere .i. plat. Sucina .i. gemmas. Flere .i. plat .i.
 mirabat filia .i. aurea. Respicere .i. plat. Seuera .i. sobria. Camciem .i.
 rem. Animosia. magnanima. Senta .i. spinosa. Situ .i. positione. Secuta .i. du-
 nebatur. Canopica .i. aegyptiaca .i. mundana. Tribunal dr. qd inde pcep-
 orbuntur. Fascib. .i. honoribus. Ssternere .i. flectere adoratō. Rasilibus
 ulis .i. rasib. lapidib. .i. dolatis pinagines. Friuula .i. densa. cliens .i. seruus
 tuat .i. turpiter semclinat. Exagitante .i. comouente. Excitus .i. cono-
 lictor .i. carnisfex alig. Gemalis .i. nuptialis. Temeraria .i. p. sup. p. x.
 nltas .i. infirmitas. p. subigit int. uct. dot. luncea pectora .i. iuuenilia
 ut utrumq. .i. ex utraq. parte. Iuiat .i. iucundū est. Eliciti .i. expressi.
 tacti. Carnificina .i. locus t. cruciatio. Repens .i. subita. plaudet .i. ludet.
 cur. Satelles .i. minister t. sequax. Uetomae .i. p. ante. Hispanae. N. carae
 gemat hiems. co. in hieme ibi sunt. rosulenta. **ME TRUM**
DE CAS SUL LA B. XXI.
 tem quandoquidē. p. quo. castate.
 le .i. uanum. placidus refert .i. responder. cauea .i. circum
 p. mis. atq. Solut .i. destruit. Expedire .i. soluer. Nexus .i.
 amina. Notam .i. signum. Excitat .i. erigitur
ME TRUM CHI CONI LIUM. XXIV
 ouent .i. colligunt. Decionib. .i. potestatibus
 p. tum .i. p. morte. Refert .i. distat.

Plate 13. Leiden,
 Universiteits-
 bibliotheek, VLO 92,
 fol. 133r (117% of true
 size)






Plate 16. Leiden,
Universiteits-
bibliotheek, VLO 92,
fol. 138v (detail, 192%
of true size)

124
Subsistentia aut unus cuiusq. psonae hoc ipsum qd ex
stat et subsistat ostendat. Ideo q. ppter sabellitū. Sim
tres ee subsistentias confitendas qd quasi tres subsistentias
psonas significare uideretur. Candidus
Indagandum quid ē essentia & essentialitas quid existentia
et existentialitas quid substantia et quid substantialitas
sed aliud et aliud non recipitur in eadē non ff. in alio ut
aliud est ut accedens in subiecto. Differt aut existentia ab
existentialitate qm existentia iam in eo est ut sit ei esse at
vero existentialitas potentia est ut possit esse. nondū est ipsū
esse. Multo aut magis existentia a substantia differt qm exis
tentia ipsum ee est & solum esse. & non in alio esse aut
subiectū alterius. sed unū et solū ipsum esse. Substanti
a aut non ee solū habet sed & quale aliquid esse
subiacenti in sepositis qualitatib; & idcirco di
citur subiectum. ON substantia dicitur ON
TOT HC substantialitas quae post geni
tas ab existentia & existentialita
te; deus aut ipse est unū & so

Plate 17. Leiden,
Universiteits-
bibliotheek, VLO 92,
fol. 124r (108% of true
size)

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

et inquit quia est in claustris. Item de peccatis. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Item de peccatis moralibus. Item de virtutibus. Item de peccatis. Item de regimine vite.

Manuscript Index

Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales

773B 119

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preussischer
Kulturbesitz

Diez. B. Sant. 66 55

Bern, Burgerbibliothek

183 111

Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique

3067-73 116, 119, 205

5380-84 52, 57, 68, 196-7

9565-66 95

Cambridge

Corpus Christi College

71 (C) 179

University Library

Ff. 3. 5 179

Mm. 13. 2 178

Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek

154 120, 123

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek

BPL 28 76, 88, 93-100, 203

BPL 82 12

BPL 127 AC 83, 200

BPL 191 D 124, 211

BPL 1925 121, 204

VLF 12b 30

VLF 30 27, 193

VLF 48 22, 38-9, 195

VLF 70 87, 88-93, 100, 202

VLF 94 27

VLF 122 30

VLO 92 106-25, 206-10

VLQ 18 36, 194

VLQ 33 80-3, 85, 99, 199

Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek

1253 84

London, British Library

Burney 224 139, 155

Royal 15 C. iv 177

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana

B 18 inf. 156

Montpellier, Bibliothèque Inter-Universitaire

Section médecine, H 335 83-5, 99,

201

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek

Clm. 6292 54-5

Clm. 7205 136-7, 155, 212-3

Clm. 14100 121

Clm. 14809 121-2

Oxford

Bodleian Library

Arch. Seld. B. 16 168

Canon. class. lat. 1 156

Lat. class. d. 39 177

Junius 1 114

Rawlinson B. 467 116

- Jesus College
20 116
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France
lat. 2858 29
lat. 6370 30
lat. 6795 176
lat. 7418 95
lat. 7900A 39
lat. 8001 136, 155
lat. 8658A 43-4
lat. 18275 83-4
- Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky
III.E.30 85, 99
- St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek
65 81
251 95
817 77-83, 198
820 81
- St Omer, Bibliothèque municipale
652 178
- Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale
404 96
- Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
Ottob. lat. 1302 176
Ottob. lat. 1459 176
Vat. lat. 5222 156
Vat. lat. 10281 116
- Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana
lat. XIV.222 (4007) 136, 155
Z. lat. 497 54, 56
- Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek
Q 91 136, 155, 214
- Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek
Cod. Guelf. 13.10, Aug. 40 130, 139,
156, 215

General Index

- Abbo of Fleury 90
Accessus ad auctores 34, 88, 99
 Adalbold (bishop) 58
 Aimoin 90
 Alcuin 20
 De disputatio rhetorica et uirtutibus 92-3
 Alexander Neckham 15
 Alexandria
 library 31
 scholars 31
 Ambrose 37, 174
 Amplonius Rating de Berka 135
 Ancora 32
Anecdoton Parisinum 32
 Anglo-Saxon 112
 Apollo 141, 149
 Apuleius 90
 De deo Socratis 18, 169-70
 Aristarchus of Samothrace 31
 Aristotle 16, 79, 90
 Categories 15, 77, 80
 De interpretatione 15
 Arithmetic 79
 Arnulf of Orléans 17-18, 131-155
 Mutationes 134
 Asterikus 19, 32-3, 36
 Asterisk (mark-up symbol) – *see* Asterikus
 Augustine 37
 Ausonius, *Ephemeris* 18
 Auxerre
 abbey 31, 38
 city 37
 Bacchus 147
 Bavaria 58
 Beauvais 93
 Belgium 56, 58
 Bobbio 28
 Boethius 20, 37, 90, 98-9, 141
 De consolatione philosophiae 29, 82, 84
 De topicis differentiis 15-16, 91, 97-9
 Booklists 53, 55-9, 70
 Books of Solomon 96
 Bromius 147
 Bury St Edmunds 179
 Cadmus 140-54
 Cantatorium 15
 Caroline minuscule (script) 27, 112
 Carolingian
 court library 56
 libraries 24
 manuscripts 24, 30, 55
 period 13, 24, 26, 37
 renaissance 23
 scholars 37, 45

- Cassian, *Conlationes* 78
- Cassiodorus 32
- Expositio in Psalmos* 32
- Historia tripartita* 175
- Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum* 32, 78, 80, 87, 91-2
- Catena* format 17
- Cephissus River 142
- Ceres 64
- Charlemagne 23, 28
- court of 53, 71
- Charles the Bald 23, 29
- Charybdis 28
- Chrisimon 32, 33
- Christ Church Canterbury 177
- Church Fathers 26, 37— *see* Ambrose, Augustine
- Cicero 41, 78, 86, 90, 93, 176, 178
- De inventione* 15-16, 19, 29, 78-83, 86-9, 98-100, 120
- De senectute* 30
- De somnium Scipionis* (Dream of Scipio) 28, 81
- Lucullus* 175
- Nova rhetorica* 16
- Topica* 15
- Claudian 58-59, 68
- De bello Gildonico* 56
- De bello Gothico* 56
- De raptu Proserpinae* 56
- In Eutropium* 56
- In Rufinum* 56, 69
- Claudius of Turin, Commentary on *Genesis* 124
- Commentary 34
- Commentum Cornuti* 37
- Conrad of Hirsau 15
- Constantine the Great 175
- Continent 179
- Corrector 28
- Crete 141
- Damiano da Pola 135
- De discipline scholarum* 124
- De immundo spiritu* 62
- Delphi 141, 149
- Diagrams 77-100
- Dialectics 82
- Diple 32
- Donatus 35, 86
- Dungal (scholar) 28
- Ecclesiastes — *see* Books of Solomon
- Egbert of Liège 54, 57, 62-3, 65-8
- The Well-Laden Ship* 18, 60, 62
- England 109, 112, 179
- English vernacular minuscule (script) 112
- Fecunda ratis* — *see* Egbert of Liège, *The Well-Laden Ship*
- Fleury
- abbey 26, 31, 53, 90
- school 93
- Florilegia 53-6, 58-9, 67-8, 132

- Florilegium Angelicum* 132
Florilegium Gallicum 53, 70, 132
 Florus of Lyon 42, 46
 Fortunatius 87
 France 43, 56, 59, 70, 108-9
 Francia 177
 Fulco of Orléans 132
 Fulda Abbey 29
 Fulgentius (bishop of Ruspe) 175
 Fulgentius 37, 174-5
 Mythologiae 84

 Gellius 121
 Gembloux Abbey 57, 68-9
 Geometry 79
 Gerbert of Aurillac 15
 Gerbert of Rheims 79
 Germany 27, 56, 109, 122
 Giovanni del Virgilio 135
 Gloucester 174
 Gospel of St Luke 66
 Gothic (script) 110, 112, 136
 Grammar 45, 82, 86, 131
 Greece 150
 Greek alphabet 30, 36, 150
 Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 175
 Gregory the Great 65-6
 Homiliae in evangelia 63
 Grillius 86, 91

 Hainaut 57
 Heiric of Auxerre 32, 43, 46

 Hercules 151
 Heriger of Lobbes 57-8, 66-8
 Herodotus 150
 Hilary of Orléans 132
 Hincmar of Rheims 32, 43
 Holsterbooks 14-15
 Homer 31
 Horace 15, 24, 67, 93, 121
 Ars poetica 59, 122
 Carmina 122
 De arte poetica epistula ad Pisonem 122
 Hucbald of Saint-Amand 96

 Isidore of Seville 32, 37, 150
 Etymologiae 32, 80
 Italy 109

 Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 174
 John of Garland, *Integumenta Ovidii* 135,
 139
 John the Scot Eriugena 46
 Jordanes
 Getica 175
 Romana 175
 Juvenal 67
 Satires 37

 Lachmanm, Karl 26
 Langland, *Piers Plowman* 119
 Lares 64
 Latin alphabet 150
Liber glossarum 32

- Liège 17, 70
 diocese 54-5, 57, 68, 71
Littera praegothica (script) 111
 Livy 23
 Lobbes
 abbey 69-70
 booklist 58, 68
 Louis the Pious 23
 Lucan 36, 150
Lucretius Oblongus 27
Lucretius Quadratus 27
 Lucretius 26, 28
 De rerum naturae 27
Lunellum 115
 Lupus of Ferrières 29-32, 43, 46

 Macrobius 26, 28
 Commentary on the *Dream of Scipio* 30
 Saturnalia 174, 179
 Mainz 27
 Mark-up symbols 43 – see Ancora, Asterikus,
 Chrisimon, Diple, Obelus, Require, Theta
 Martianus Capella 36, 39, 82
De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii 37
 Mathematics 79, 82
 Music 79, 82
 Mythographus 18

 Namur 57, 68
 New Testament 27
 Notger (bishop) 58

 Obelus (mark-up symbol) 19, 32, 43
 Olbert (abbot) 68
 Oratory 88
 Origen 96
 Commentary on the *Song of Songs* 95-6
 Orléans 70, 91
Orrmulum 114
 Otric of Magdeburg 79
 Otto II 79
 Ovid 15, 54, 143, 145, 147, 151, 154-5
 Amores 132
 Ars amatoria 132
 Bellum ciuile 132-3
 De remedio amoris cum glossis 122, 132-3
 Epistulae ex Ponto 132
 Fasti 132-3
 Heroides 132
 Metamorphoses 16-17, 131, 133, 135,
 138-9, 149, 155
 Tristia 132
 Oxford University 16

 Paratext 34
 Paul the Deacon, *Historia romana* 175
 Pauline Epistles 64
 Pavia 28
 Persius 36
 Satires 37
 Peter Damian 125
Philosophia 83-4, 86
Philosophia trifariae 96
 Phoenicians 143-4, 153

- Pierre Bersuire, *Ovidius moralizatus* 135
- Plato, *Timaeus* 82
- Pliny 176
- Medicinae* 108
- Natural History 175
- Poggio Bracciolini 27
- Porphyry 90
- Isagoge* 15
- Priapus 64
- Priscian 15-16, 86, 144
- Carmina christiana* 108
- Probus 175
- Prologues 88
- Proverbs – see Books of Solomon
- Prudentius 108
- Cathemerinon* 108
- Contra Symmachum* 174
- Peristephanon* 108
- Psychomachia* 108
- Psalter 41
- Quadrivium 79
- Quintilian 93
- Remigius of Auxerre 39
- Require (sign) 43
- Rhabanus Maurus 29
- Rheims 43, 90
- Rhetoric 82, 97, 99
- Rhetorica ad Herennium* 15, 83, 86-7
- Roman Empire 33
- Rufinus of Aquileia 108
- Schedulae* 124
- Scholial* 17
- Scholion* format 17
- Scientia* 86
- Scylla 28
- Semitextualis (script) 13
- Seneca, *Letters* 43
- Servius 35, 37
- Sidonius Apollinaris 18, 174
- Song of Songs – see Books of Solomon
- Spartoi 154
- St Albans 179
- St Bertin Abbey 178
- Statius 15
- Stemmatology 26
- Suetonius 177-8
- De uita Caesarum* 175-6
- Supertextus notarum tironianarum* 42
- Symmachus 18, 174-5
- Terence 23-4, 35-6
- The Well-Laden Ship* – see Egbert of Liège
- Thebes 140, 155
- Theodosian Code 175
- Theta 32
- Thierry of Chartres 99
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles* 123
- Thomas Werken (scribe) 178
- Tibullus 17-18, 53-72
- Tiro 41
- Tironian notes 30-1, 36, 39, 41-3
- Tours 30, 43

- Trido (mark-up symbol) 30
 Trivium 79, 82
 Troper 15
 Troy 175

 Uggucione of Pisa, *Deriuuationes* 134
 Uncial (script) 27

 Victorinus 78, 86-7, 108
 Commentary on the *De inventione* 91
 Virgil 23-4, 35-6
 Bucolica 121
 Poetria 16

 William Gray (bishop of Ely) 178
 William of Conches 82
 William of Malmesbury 18, 169-80
 Breviarium Alaricum 175
 Commentary on *Lamentations* 169, 174
 De miraculis beatae uirginis Mariae 171
 Gesta Pontificum Anglorum 178
 Gesta Regum Anglorum 174, 178
 Polyhistor 175
 William of Orléans, *Versus Bursarii* 132
 Winchcombe 174
 Worcester 174

 Zomino da Pistoia 135