



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Written Culture at Ten Duinen: Cistercian Monks and Their Books, c. 1125-c. 1250

Janzen, J.P.C.

Citation

Janzen, J. P. C. (2019, September 3). *Written Culture at Ten Duinen: Cistercian Monks and Their Books, c. 1125-c. 1250*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/76430>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/76430>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/76430>

Author: Janzen J.P.C.

Title: Written Culture at Ten Duinen: Cistercian Monks and Their Books

Issue Date: 2019-09-03

INTRODUCTION

0.1 The Abbey of Ten Duinen

Carved out of the dunes on the Flemish coast at Koksijde, Ten Duinen was one of the largest and most successful Cistercian houses of the twelfth century.¹ Although the grounds survive only as an archaeological site, the abbey's remaining books form a remarkable collection held primarily in the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek Historisch Fonds and the historic library of the Grootseminarie, the former home of Ten Duinen's community after its relocation to Bruges.

The physical remains of early Ten Duinen, in the form of Cistercian glass,² bricks,³ tiles,⁴ and even the bones of the abbey's monks and their dependants,⁵ have been extensively studied for what they reveal about material culture, economy, and daily life at the abbey. However, the manuscripts made and used by the monks of Ten Duinen offer further opportunities to uncover more about the intellectual, spiritual, and communal life of the abbey's scribes and readers. Through careful codicological and palaeographical analysis of the manuscripts which belonged to Ten Duinen in the first century of its foundation, including both those made in the monastery and those made elsewhere, I aim to build a profile of the abbey's scriptorium and library. Moreover, by examining reading aids and notation within their books, I attempt to illuminate how these Flemish Cistercians, best known for their physical and economic preoccupation with turning swathes of untamed dunes into arable land, engaged with and participated in the intellectual pursuits of the so-called 'Long Twelfth Century'.⁶

¹ In size, Ten Duinen's community rivaled those of Clairvaux, Fountains, and Rievaulx in the twelfth century. It likely had a greater community of lay brothers than any other abbey by 1300; see Lekai, *The Cistercians*, pp. 44, 337.

² About 15,000 fragments of plain and stained glass from the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries have been excavated from the Ten Duinen site (1949–2006), although they are rapidly disintegrating due to poor extraction and storage practices in earlier decades; see Wouters, Royen, and Nys, 'Archaeological Window Glass from Cistercian Abbeys', 103.

³ Ten Duinen's original buildings were made of sand bricks. One of the abbey's monks had made the cloister's washhouse bricks in 1310, probably in the same manner as those before him. Cistercians were known for their self-sufficient building; Oderic Vitalis once remarked that '[t]hey have built monasteries with their own hands'; see Williams, *The Cistercians*, pp. 196–97.

⁴ Remarkable thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century examples of Ten Duinen's homemade decorated glazed tiles, perhaps made at the contemporary kiln located at their Ten Bogaerde grange, have been unearthed from various ruins; Hunt, *Illuminating the Borders*, pp. 36–37; France, *The Cistercians*, p. 201. For detailed analysis of Ten Duinen's tiles, see van Nerom's extensive work, especially "'Cistercian Tiles'".

⁵ As an active archaeological site from 1949 until 2006, numerous studies have been published on the bodily remains of Ten Duinen's medieval inhabitants. See, for example, Poleta and Katzenberg, 'Reconstruction of the Diet in a Mediaeval Monastic Community from the Coast of Belgium'.

⁶ The term 'Long Twelfth Century' is often employed by historians of intellectual and material culture to delineate a transformative period in the Latin West. Although loosely defined, it is useful to this particular study in its familiarity and accommodation. In using this term and its approximate dating boundaries of

Although it has arguably received less international scholarly attention than French Cistercian monasteries such as Cîteaux and Clairvaux, English houses including Rievaulx and Fountains, and Eberbach in Germany, Ten Duinen is regionally well known. A number of Flemish, Dutch, and French studies have been written on various aspects of the monastery and its history, and it often figures prominently in English-language studies of Cistercian economy, for good reason. While Cîteaux had been created as an escape from worldliness, within a century of foundation its daughter house Ten Duinen was immensely wealthy, with large land holdings and extensive ties to both local and foreign markets.⁷ The abbey not only had its own fleet of ships for trading wool in England by 1190,⁸ but also sent wool inland via canal systems to markets in Douay and Liège.⁹ By the mid-thirteenth century, Ten Duinen's lay brothers had converted some 25,000 acres of dune-covered land into twenty-five profitable granges.¹⁰ At the time of its foundation as a Cistercian institution it likely housed at most a few dozen men; by c. 1250, the abbey supported 120 choir monks and 248 lay brothers.¹¹ It also boasted some illustrious figures in the period covered by this study: Ten Duinen's first Cistercian abbot, Robrecht of Bruges (1138–1153), replaced his friend Bernard of Clairvaux as Clairvaux's abbot when Bernard died; its third abbot, Idesbald van der Gracht (1155–1167), is a canonized saint; and in 1193/4, the strength of Ten Duinen's reputation for trade between the Continent and England placed its Abbot Elias in negotiations for Richard I's release from German captivity.¹²

Ten Duinen attracts scholars from various fields with its twelfth- and thirteenth-century successes and their material remains. Cistercian economic historians, glass and tile experts, and archaeologists of this region are no doubt familiar with the abbey. Within the Low Countries, it has also captured the interest of manuscript scholars periodically over the last sixty years, and is often studied alongside its daughter houses Ter Doest and Clairmarais, as well as the chapter at St Donatian's cathedral in Bruges.¹³ Although by no means exhaustive, a short overview of the key literature studying Ten Duinen's manuscripts is useful before embarking on the current study.

1075 and 1225, I keep with Erik Kwakkel's VIDI project 'Turning Over a New Leaf: Manuscript Innovation in the Twelfth Century Renaissance', with which this dissertation is affiliated.

⁷ Jordan, 'Gender Concerns', 76.

⁸ For a time, Ten Duinen owned a residence in Dover for the use of their trade representatives. In 1187, Henry II of England permitted the abbey to sell their old ships and build new ones within his domain. In 1190, Ten Duinen was censured by the Cistercian General Chapter for transporting others' cargo (presumably for profit) on their ships; see Williams, *The Cistercians*, pp. 391, 396. For the censure, see *Twelfth-Century Statutes*, ed. by Waddell, p. 207 n. 44.

⁹ Williams, *The Cistercians*, p. 358.

¹⁰ Lekai, *The Cistercians*, p. 298.

¹¹ Jordan, 'Gender Concerns', 76.

¹² Southern, *Western Society and the Church*, p. 267.

¹³ Ter Doest, established as a Benedictine house in 1106 and converted by Ten Duinen in 1175, was located in today's Lissewege, about 50 km northeast from Ten Duinen, near Zeebrugge. Clairmarais, founded by Bernard of Clairvaux in 1140, was located in today's Nord-Pas-de-Calais region, only a couple of kilometers from St-Omer and about 50 km southwest of Ten Duinen.

0.2 Early-Modern Librarians to Post-Enlightenment Libraries

When opening most manuscripts from Ten Duinen's library (and indeed those from Ter Doest), one is greeted with a title inscription added by Carolus de Visch (1596–1666).¹⁴ Following a stint at the University of Douai and two years teaching at the Cistercian abbey of Eberbach, in 1632 de Visch was appointed confessor of Groeninge, a convent in Kortrijk under Ten Duinen's care.¹⁵ After a few tense years there, he was reappointed to Hemelsdale, then in Diksmuide, and served for twelve successful years, during which he wrote eighteen sermons.¹⁶ Joining Ten Duinen — newly located in Bruges in what is now the Grootseminarie — as librarian around 1644, he became prior in 1649. His responsibilities included the care of the 1025 books inventoried in 1638, about a decade after Ter Doest, and therefore its library, was absorbed into its motherhouse under Abbot Bernard Campmans.¹⁷ Between c. 1625 and c. 1650 a large proportion of books in this amalgamated library were rebound in simple brown leather with an embossed stamp of Ten Duinen's contemporary crest, now known as Campmans' bindings, suggesting the abbot's shared interest in maintaining the collection.¹⁸ In his years at the Grootseminarie, de Visch wrote the histories of his own and other Cistercian abbeys,¹⁹ as well as his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis*.²⁰ Significant to my study, and to all who have the pleasure of handling these same manuscripts some 370 years later, de Visch created a new library catalogue in 1644.²¹ Not only is his clear and deliberate hand a characteristic feature of many of Ten Duinen's books, but his catalogue also serves as the foundation for all future scholarship on the abbey's manuscripts.

Following de Visch's careful handling of Ten Duinen's manuscripts they endured, perhaps, several centuries of lesser interest and rougher treatment. At the time of Campmans' death in 1642, Ten Duinen had forty-four choir monks, sixteen lay brothers, four novices, and four guests. These sixty-eight members were the final highpoint for the abbey; it encountered steady decline from then onwards.²² In 1796, in a move that, retrospectively, appears typical of the era of the French Revolution, the

¹⁴ Geirnaert's entry in the Belgian *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek*, 6, pp. 986–94, provides a brief biography of Carolus de Visch. Geirnaert has also written a thorough biography of de Visch: 'De Duinheer Carolus de Visch'.

¹⁵ Hoste, Nuyttens, and Van Bockstaele, *De Glans van Cîteaux*, p. 176.

¹⁶ Hoste, Nuyttens, and Van Bockstaele, *De Glans van Cîteaux*, pp. 20, 170.

¹⁷ Following decades of interference and unrest, Ten Duinen's small community fled to their grange, Ten Bogaerde, in 1597. They joined the few remaining Ter Doest monks at Ter Doest's refuge on the Potterierei in Bruges in 1624, and in April 1628 began construction of their new shared home, the Grootseminarie. The monks salvaged material from the ruins of Ten Duinen in Koksijde to rebuild their abbey in Bruges; see Beernaert, 'Abdij Ten Duinen in Brugge', pp. 34, 37; Hoste, Nuyttens, and Van Bockstaele, *De Glans van Cîteaux*, pp. 25, 28.

¹⁸ See Chapter 5.6.

¹⁹ De Visch, *Compendium chronologicum*.

²⁰ Printed in Douay in 1649 and again in Cologne in 1656.

²¹ Geirnaert, 'Carolus de Visch', p. 990. Derolez, 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?', 225, attributes the catalogue's publication by Antonius Sanderus to 1641.

²² Hoste, Nuyttens, and Van Bockstaele, *De Glans van Cîteaux*, pp. 25–26.

majority of Ten Duinen's books, along with collections from other institutions, were seized by the governing Leie Department²³ to form the basis of a new *École central*.²⁴ However, the few surviving monks of the Grootseminarie — by 1800 only eighteen remained²⁵ — managed to retain a small collection of the abbey's finest books for themselves. The entire school library was then attained by the City of Bruges in 1804 and relocated to the 'Gotische Zaal' of the city hall, which became the Bruges City Library in 1819. The last monk of Ten Duinen, Nicolaas de Roover, passed away on 23 April 1833 with the Grootseminarie collection still in his care.²⁶ He bequeathed the books and manuscripts, along with his furniture and money, to two nephews. The contemporary bishop of Bruges, Monseigneur Boussem, had wanted these last vestiges of Ten Duinen's library to find a permanent home in the Grootseminarie, and managed some weeks later to purchase the manuscripts and books for 1,733 francs.²⁷

0.3 Twentieth-Century Catalogues: Listing and Sorting

Although a number of small catalogues and studies including the manuscripts of Ten Duinen were produced between the era of Carolus de Visch and the twentieth century, none warrant particular attention here. The early twentieth century, however, presented a new, organized interest in Ten Duinen's manuscripts that amounted, for the most part, to rigorous listing and sorting into topical catalogues. A thorough annotated bibliography of these efforts, *Bibliographie des catalogues des manuscrits des bibliothèques de Belgique*, was completed by Paul Faider in 1933.²⁸ Excluding them from detailed analysis here is not intended to diminish their value to the historical study of Ten Duinen's books. Rather, they present the same challenges as most older studies: dating of undated manuscripts is imprecise at best and inaccurate at worst; terminology is inconsistent, outdated, and subjective; arguments, due to the changes in scholarly attitudes and standards, are difficult to defend in a modern academic sense; and, in some cases, copies are no longer attainable.

Ten Duinen's books would once again receive the level of attention they had enjoyed from Carolus de Visch some two and a half centuries later. In 1907, Alphons De Poorter, a priest with a doctorate in literature and philosophy from the Catholic

²³ Following the Napoleonic Wars during the French occupation of Flanders (1795–1814), the region was divided along its two greatest rivers into the Leie (West Flanders) and Scheldt (East Flanders) departments.

²⁴ Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', p. 76.

²⁵ Hoste, Nuytens, and Van Bockstaele, *De Glans van Cîteaux*, p. 26.

²⁶ Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', p. 76.

²⁷ Viaene, 'De bibliotheek van het Grootseminarie te Brugge', p. 193.

²⁸ Faider, *Bibliographie des catalogues des manuscrits*; see the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek collection on pp. 5–6. This section is reproduced in the introduction of De Poorter's *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Bruges*, pp. 14–19.

University of Leuven, was appointed librarian of the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek.²⁹ He was immensely prolific throughout his career, focusing dozens of publications on the library's manuscripts and early printed books,³⁰ and also sat on the board of the Genootschap voor Geschiedenis te Brugge from 1916 until 1931.³¹ He compiled several topical catalogues including (but not limited to) books from Ten Duinen's former library, and of manuscripts of mathematics and astronomy,³² medicine,³³ Latin grammar,³⁴ sermons,³⁵ law,³⁶ sophism,³⁷ Aristotelian philosophy,³⁸ Books of Hours,³⁹ and Peter Lombard's *Sentences*.⁴⁰ The findings in these and other of his numerous publications were compiled and expanded in his catalogue of the city's manuscript collection, the *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Bruges*, in 1934. It was the cumulative result of eighteen years of diligent work on 610 manuscripts. Although there had been a number of previous catalogues containing many of the manuscripts now under his care, his represented a level of consistency and detail unachieved by predecessors.⁴¹

De Poorter's catalogues were an enormous undertaking and continue to be a worthy tool for researchers. Much like other large catalogues in the age of print, its entries are generally brief and contain standard information: a headline with the manuscript's date (often by century only), support, number of folios, dimensions, layout, and lines; followed by title(s), incipits and explicits for the various contents, bibliography where applicable, and straight-forward (if too simplistic) notes on initials,⁴² rubrics, pastedowns, damage, pressmarks, inscriptions, peculiarities, and,

²⁹ Visart de Bocarme, 'In memoriam Alfons De Poorter', 142. This obituary incorrectly cites the date of De Poorter's appointment as Librarian as 1906. It is correctly cited as 1908 in Vandamme, *Het Bibliotheekwezen in Brugge*, p. 63.

³⁰ A bibliography of fifty-nine works is included with his obituary; see Visart de Bocarme, 'Alfons De Poorter', 144–47.

³¹ The Genootschap voor Geschiedenis te Brugge (Historical Society of Bruges) is the oldest still-active history society in Belgium. Beginning in 1839, it was known as the 'Société d'emulation pour l'histoire et les antiquités de la Flandre Occidentale' until 1934; see Genootschap voor Geschiedenis, 'Wie zijn wij'.

³² De Poorter and Alliaume, 'Catalogue des manuscrits mathématiques et astronomiques'.

³³ De Poorter, 'Catalogue des manuscrits de médecine médiévale'.

³⁴ De Poorter, 'Catalogue des manuscrits de grammaire latine médiévale'.

³⁵ De Poorter, 'Catalogue des manuscrits de prédication médiévale'.

³⁶ De Poorter and Brys, 'Les manuscrits de droit medieval'.

³⁷ De Poorter, 'Les manuscrits de sophistique'.

³⁸ De Poorter, 'Manuscrits de philosophie aristotélicienne'.

³⁹ De Poorter, 'Catalogue des livres d'heures et de prières'.

⁴⁰ De Poorter, 'Les manuscrits des *Sentences*'.

⁴¹ In 1971, Jan Vandamme, then Head Librarian and historian of the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek, discussed how De Poorter's interests came at some cost to the library itself: "Het werk dat hij gedaan heeft, moest gedaan worden en is schitterend gedaan; zijn catalogus der handschriften blijft na meer dan dertig jaar een werkinstrument van onvervangbare waarde. [...] Er waren toen andere noden en behoeften dan aan handschriften en wiegedrukken, er was een ander lezerspubliek dan historici, bibliofielen en paleografen! Noch De Poorter, noch de bibliotheekcommissie, noch het stadsbestuur hadden dit ingezien" (*Het Bibliotheekwezen in Brugge*, p. 76).

⁴² For example, the entry for **MS 19** states that 'presque toutes les initiales sont rouges'. This is correct; however, it conceals that there are also blue initials, such as the large and small ones on f. 63^v, and that

sparingly, on bindings.⁴³ Manuscripts are attributed to particular monasteries by several means. First, pressmarks are employed: manuscripts are known to have been in Ten Duinen's library during Campmans' abbacy (1623–1642) by the standard pressmark of the library at that time, a small, black Burgundian cross customarily stamped on the opening flyleaf or folio.⁴⁴ For the most part, De Poorter does not attempt to discern which scriptoria these manuscripts were produced in, nor, when lacking an ownership inscription, the library to which they had originally belonged; given that the pressmark was added after the amalgamation of Ten Duinen and Ter Doest, it is found in earlier books from both libraries.⁴⁵ Fortunately, ownership inscriptions and anathemas enable many earlier manuscripts to be divided into 'Ter Doest' or 'Ten Duinen' categories, although inscription dates (a possible marker for the entry of books made elsewhere into their libraries) are not provided. In instances where no such inscription is present, and no prior research is referenced for locating, no additional indicators are used to address the manuscripts' origins or provenance. Albert Derolez's primary, and indeed remarkable, contribution to the study of Ten Duinen's manuscripts is his identification of these additional indicators and attribution of manuscripts to mother or daughter house based on them, as discussed below.⁴⁶

In 1928, Dom Donatien De Bruyne published a small catalogue of manuscripts in the Grootseminarie which he (incorrectly) identified as those listed on **Bruges, Openbare Bibliotheek, MS 55**, f. 117^v.⁴⁷ It was followed up between 1940 and 1945 by a more thorough catalogue by Egied Idesbald Strubbe, a historian, lawyer, and professor of Ghent University. His addition, *Handschriften op het archief van het Groot*

yellow initials, which are arguably less common in contemporary northwestern European manuscripts than are red or blue, are numerous (see, for example, ff. 1^r and 8^v). De Poorter, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique*, p. 35.

⁴³ To again use **MS 19** as an example, the entry states only 'Reliure veau ais de chêne. Le titre sous corne est blesse'. Indeed, the binding is calf (or even just cow) leather over oak boards, but the leather still holds a large amount of hair on both the front and back. All clasps and bosses are missing, but holes and metal fragments remain. And, while the thirteenth-century title on the lower back cover is missing parts of both its metal frame and horn fenestra, a prominent black **A** and smaller red **T** also remain, unnoted, as thirteenth-century library shelfmarks. De Poorter, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique*, p. 35.

⁴⁴ De Poorter, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique*, p. 8.

⁴⁵ For example, **MS 8** had been earlier recognized as coming from the neighbourhood of Ghent on account of the saints in its calendar. This and similar instances are accounted for with supporting citations; De Poorter, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique*, pp. 26–27.

⁴⁶ To return to **MS 19**: De Poorter's catalogue entry states: 'Au verso du dernier f. Liber sancta Marie de Dunis' (p. 35). Although no date is offered, this is correct: a thirteenth-century inscription is present. Beyond this indicator however, the manuscript can be identified as having belonged to Ten Duinen's library on account of the placement of its fenestra and library shelfmark on the lower back cover, based on Derolez, 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?'. Furthermore, it has the thirteenth-century foliation exclusive to books from Ten Duinen's library, offering yet another indicator for attribution.

⁴⁷ De Bruyne, 'Un ancien catalogue des manuscrits'. As noted by Vander Plaetse, 'Index van de handschriften van het Grootseminarie van Brugge', p. 125 n. 1, the findings of this effort were largely rejected and set to rights in the *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii*, p. 61 and Derolez, 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?', 226.

Seminarie te Brugge, is in the spirit of De Poorter's catalogue.⁴⁸ It contains brief catalogue entries for the manuscripts of the Grootseminarie, including forty-four attributed to Ten Duinen.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, the catalogue was never published; its few copies enjoy rather limited circulation, but have informed subsequent studies on the Grootseminarie collection.

0.4 Towards Today: Focused Studies

The first study focused specifically on Ten Duinen's early scriptorium and library was a Dutch monograph by Gerard Isaac Lief tinck titled *De librijen en scriptoria der Westvlaamse Cisterciënser-abdijen Ter Duinen en Ter Doest in de 12e en 13e eeuw en de betrekkingen tot het atelier van de kapittelschool van Sint Donatiaan te Brugge*. Lief tinck, a colleague and friend of Strubbe's from Amsterdam,⁵⁰ was a curator at Leiden University's library from 1942 until 1957, instructor of manuscript studies beginning in 1948, and professor of palaeography from 1963 until his retirement in 1972.⁵¹ His monograph is, by virtue of covering the same time period, the precursor to my study. Lief tinck's principle argument is that the cathedral school and chapter house of St Donatian in Bruges played a central role in the development of the scriptorium and library of both Ten Duinen and its daughter-house Ter Doest. He posits that when Ter Doest was founded in 1175 with twelve monks and three lay brothers from Ten Duinen under the leadership of a former deacon from St Donatian's, Haket of Bruges, the three houses formed a strong cultural bond, with St Donatian's at the head. Influence from St Donatian's supposedly increased when Haket left Ter Doest to become abbot of Ten Duinen in 1179.⁵² Lief tinck argues that the twelfth-century style of Ten Duinen's manuscripts underwent a shift in the last quarter of the century due to this new bond,⁵³ and that the books from this period could have been made at St Donatian's for Ten Duinen's use on account of the aesthetic and intellectual quality of their contents.⁵⁴ He also contends that most of Ter Doest's early library was built up with St Donatian's contributions, citing some colophons indicating that books were gifted, stylistic similarities between St Donatian's and Ter Doest's books, the contents of

⁴⁸ According to the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek, Strubbe collaborated with Joris Lambrecht on this catalogue. See Openbare Bibliotheek Brugge, 'Middeleeuwse bibliotheken Ten Duinen en Ter Doest', *Openbare Bibliotheek Brugge Blog*.

⁴⁹ 'Dunes Abbey', nos 1358–1402, in *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii*, Vol. 7, ed. by Derolez, Victor, and Falmagne, pp. 113–15.

⁵⁰ Strubbe's contributions and friendship are mentioned in Lief tinck, *De librijen en scriptoria*, pp. 9, 11, 19.

⁵¹ Gumbert, 'Levensbericht G. I. Lief tinck', 69.

⁵² Lief tinck, *De librijen en scriptoria*, pp. 18–19.

⁵³ See Appendix A, Lief tinck, *De librijen en scriptoria*, pp. 62–70.

⁵⁴ See Appendix B, Lief tinck, *De librijen en scriptoria*, pp. 19–20, 71–73.

their collection, and the amount of time required, in his opinion, to establish a productive scriptorium in a new monastery.⁵⁵

Lieftinck's study, while rightfully garnering respect for its palaeographical, codicological, and art historical approach, has since received much criticism. Derolez, for example, has called his argument for St Donatian's influential role over Ten Duinen and Ter Doest 'unfounded', his assessment of the manuscripts' perceived quality subjective, and his claims unrealistic.⁵⁶ Dom Anselm Hoste, in his book on the manuscripts of Ter Doest, likewise vigorously rejects Lieftinck's findings in regard to that abbey's scriptorium. He effectively counters that a few known gifts do not necessarily mean that Ter Doest's monks had no active scriptorium. Hoste points to studies of Cîteaux, as well as its four oldest daughter houses — La Ferté, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond — by Jean-Baptiste Auberger and Yolanta Załuska which indicate that each of these abbeys had a distinguishable 'quality' scriptorium from the outset, and thus Ter Doest could reasonably have done the same, especially with the spiritual and material support of the solidly-established Ten Duinen. He argues that contrary to Lieftinck's assertions, the books in Ter Doest's early library are consistent with those of other Cistercian abbeys; they were not necessarily hand-me-downs from St Donatian's canons.⁵⁷ While the focus of Hoste's study, and thus his rejections, relate to Ter Doest rather than Ten Duinen, he aptly demonstrates the flaws in Lieftinck's argument.

Evidence proves that Ter Doest received gifts of books from St Donatian's at the time of the abbey's founding and through the thirteenth century, but most of their books are now confidently identified as products of their own scriptorium.⁵⁸ Likewise, while some books in Ten Duinen's library were gifts or acquisitions from outside the monastery, as discussed in my study, their own monks made many of their books for their own communal use. Further, while ties between St Donatian's, Ten Duinen, and Ter Doest are demonstrable in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, the surviving manuscripts from Ter Doest, Ten Duinen, and the latter's other daughter house, Clairmarais (1137), provide stronger evidence of closer association between these libraries and scriptoria in this early period.⁵⁹ Taking the criticism one step further, Alphons Dewitte introduces a number of manuscripts that do not fit the characteristics of St Donatian's books as defined by Lieftinck, and cites a study by Thérèse de Hemptinne and Maurice Vandermaesen that proposes that the chancellery and school of twelfth- through fourteenth-century St Donatian never existed at all.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Lieftinck, *De libri en scriptoria*, pp. 11–18.

⁵⁶ Derolez, 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?', 221.

⁵⁷ Hoste, *De Handschriften van Ter Doest*, pp. 15–16.

⁵⁸ Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', pp. 61–62.

⁵⁹ The surviving manuscripts of Clairmarais are found mostly in the Bibliothèque d'agglomération de Saint-Omer (Pas-de-Calais); see Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', pp. 56–77.

⁶⁰ Dewitte, 'Schrijven rond de Brugse St.-Donaaskerk', p. 55; De Hemptinne and Vandermaesen, 'De ambtenaren'.

Incidents in which my own research conflicts with Lieftinck's are presented in subsequent chapters; suffice to say here that my findings regarding Ten Duinen's manuscripts agree more frequently with those of more recent research, particularly that of Derolez. Despite its flaws, Lieftinck's monograph should not be dismissed out of hand; although many of his findings have since been revised, his ambitious work was the first study of its kind on the manuscripts of Ten Duinen, Ter Doest, and St Donatian, and encouraged further interest and research.⁶¹

Following Lieftinck's study, Ten Duinen's manuscripts were largely neglected by published studies for nearly thirty years. Then, in conjunction with an exhibition by the City of Bruges, 'Vlaamse kunst op perkament', which was held in the Gruuthusemuseum from July to October 1981, a volume of the same name was released.⁶² It focuses primarily on materials from Bruges proper (including the St Donatian chapter), as well as the libraries of Ten Duinen and Ter Doest. Although brief, Dom Nicolas Huyghebaert's description of the libraries of Ten Duinen and Ter Doest offers some highlights, including discussion of the oldest manuscripts from Ten Duinen.⁶³ It is followed by a catalogue of exhibited manuscripts (with plates) from the two abbeys; although detailing only selected manuscripts, the entries by various authors are thorough and informative.⁶⁴

In 1984, Carolus de Visch's 1644 catalogue was given new life. Marie-Thérèse Isaac painstakingly completed a critical edition of his catalogue of the freshly combined Ten Duinen–Ter Doest library: *Les livres manuscrits de l'Abbaye des Dunes d'après le catalogue du XVIIe siècle*.⁶⁵ In addition to her critical edition, she builds an intellectual profile of the seventeenth-century library by categorizing the types of texts the monks owned and the proportions in which they were collected, and also identifies and indexes all surviving manuscripts originally listed by de Visch. Isaac's work is thorough and potentially quite valuable to scholars of early modern intellectual history and libraries.

During its year as Cultural Capital of Europe in 2002, from 16 August to 17 November the City of Bruges once again hosted a large exhibition of the region's manuscript patrimony, 'Besloten wereld, open boeken: Middeleeuwse handschriften in dialoog met actuele kunst', led by Laurent Busine and Ludo Vandamme. A book of the

⁶¹ Although critical of his arguments, Derolez also commends Lieftinck for undertaking the challenging research ('Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?', 221–22).

⁶² Edited by Le Loup.

⁶³ Huyghebaert also contests Lieftinck's discussion of scribes at Ter Doest ('De bibliotheken van de abdijen', pp. 61–71).

⁶⁴ 'De handschriften van Ter Doest en de Duinenabdij – een overzicht', pp. 105–40. A few years after this exhibition, a volume focusing on Ten Duinen in Bruges was published: *De Duinenabdij (1627–1796) en het Grootseminarie (1833–1983) te Brugge: Bewoners, gebouwen, kunstpatrimonium*, ed. by Denaux and Vanden Berghe. It skips Ten Duinen's beginnings outside the city but contains some valuable material for researchers of the early manuscripts, although little for my study.

⁶⁵ Isaac, *Les livres manuscrits de l'Abbaye des Dunes*.

same title was concurrently published.⁶⁶ In addition to modern art exhibited in the Grootseminarie, it featured manuscripts from Ten Duinen and its daughter-houses Clairmarais and Ter Doest. The book includes a number of chapters outlining various aspects of cultural life at the monasteries, from architecture to miniature painting, spanning the period from their foundation to dissolution. It ends with a catalogue of the exhibition's highlights, and a number of manuscripts investigated in this study are discussed by various experts within Belgium's community of manuscript scholars.

The primary difference between *Besloten wereld, open boeken* and previous publications is found in its emphasis on the links between Ten Duinen, Ter Doest, and Clairmarais. While agreeing with Lieftinck that there must have been a strong bond between Ten Duinen, Ter Doest, and St Donatian's chapter house,⁶⁷ Ludo Vandamme and Noël Geirnaert bring Clairmarais, further afield, into the network.⁶⁸ Indeed, that Clairmarais had close connections with its motherhouse and sister-house is probable; proximity and filial ties aside, their abbots were sometimes responsible for discipline and follow-up in one another's abbeys, as mandated by the Cistercian General Chapter.⁶⁹ Further, these three abbeys were bound together since the twelfth century by virtue of their shared connections to Flemish counts, Parisian networks, and English and Scandinavian contacts, and were jointly intellectual, economic, and political epicentres.⁷⁰ While its contents are not exhaustive, and arguments largely uncontroversial — as perhaps best befits an exhibition book — the findings in *Besloten wereld, open boeken* are valuable, and provide an excellent summary of research to date. Its success is likely by virtue of its contributors. Many of these scholars — including, among others, Derolez, Dewitte, Geirnaert, Hoste, Isaac, and the current curator of the Openbare Bibliotheek Historisch Fonds, Vandamme — have spent considerable portions of their careers scrutinizing these manuscripts as I do now. Although some disagreements do arise, my study does not seek to undermine or refute the work presented in this volume or by these scholars, but rather strives to add to it.

As mentioned above, Albert Derolez, Professor Emeritus of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and former Curator of Manuscripts and Rare Books at the University of Ghent, has contributed immensely to the existing body of research on the manuscripts of Ten

⁶⁶ *Besloten wereld, open boeken*, ed. by Busine and Vandamme.

⁶⁷ Lieftinck's argument for the level of influence that St Donatian's had over Ter Doest's library is also rejected here: 'Aan deze hypothese wordt thans geen geloof meer gehecht: de meeste handschriften van de bibliotheek van Ter Doest, en zeker de basiswerken van de bibliotheek, werden in Ter Doest zelf vervaardigd' (Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', p. 61).

⁶⁸ Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', pp. 56–77.

⁶⁹ An example of this disciplinary responsibility is found in the annual statutes of the General Chapter in 1201: the bishop of Tournai had a grievance against the abbot of Ter Doest, who in turn failed to attend the mandatory annual Chapter meeting. It was there ruled that the abbot of Ten Duinen and the abbot of Vaucelles were to oversee the issue's resolution. Further, Ten Duinen's abbot was to communicate (and presumably oversee) the punishment of Ter Doest's abbot — only bread and water on Fridays and suspension from his role, including his celebration of Mass — for missing the mandatory gathering until he ventured to Cîteaux for judgment. Sec. 16, *Twelfth-Century Statutes*, ed. by Waddell, p. 487.

⁷⁰ Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', pp. 69–73.

Duinen; his work in particular has the greatest bearing on my study. Derolez published his first volume of the *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii* in 1966. This initial volume was dedicated to medieval and early modern booklists, inventories, and donation records from institutions and private libraries within present-day West Flanders. Ten Duinen's records include a thirteenth-century booklist found in **MS 55**,⁷¹ copied in another scriptorium (none of the manuscripts listed survive in later catalogues of Ten Duinen's library) and all recorded book donations from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁷²

The *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii* was resumed in 1994 in English: the first volume was re-edited and expanded with texts discovered since 1966, and three additional volumes appeared including manuscripts owned within all of modern Belgium and containing critical editions of 525 items. The seventh volume was released in 2009 and includes a simplified catalogue of all manuscripts and incunabula belonging to religious houses within Belgium in the Middle Ages, totalling a remarkable 4,735 items. Books are attributed on a number of grounds with precedence given to the strongest evidence: ownership inscriptions, pressmarks, presence in an early booklist, and various aspects of house style (for example, script, codicological features, and bindings) are frequent indicators.⁷³ Many of the entries are heavily dependent on Derolez's research; Ten Duinen and Ter Doest's lists follow the findings of his 2004 article 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest? De herkomst van de handschriften in de Openbare Bibliotheek en het Grootseminarie te Brugge'.

'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest' represents Derolez's decades of familiarity with and countless hours of *in situ* comparison of the manuscripts of both houses. Specifically, he convincingly accomplishes a feat either previously avoided or ineffectively attempted: the apparently successful discernment between the manuscripts that belonged to Ten Duinen and Ter Doest before the merging of their libraries in the seventeenth century. Rather than relying solely on ownership inscriptions (which are often absent) or distinction between each abbey's house style (which is arguably untenable), Derolez uses Ten Duinen's unique foliation and features of their twelfth-through fifteenth-century bindings — stamps in the leather and clasps, binding methods, chain clamps or traces of them, title plates and fenestrae, and medieval shelfmarks — to determine the manuscripts' origins.⁷⁴ Huyghebaert, Hoste, and Issac variously attribute between 110 and 171 manuscripts to Ter Doest, and the remainder

⁷¹ Throughout this study, manuscripts from my corpus, and therefore from the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek, are regularly abbreviated in this manner, unless a full shelfmark is preferred for clarity. The shelfmarks of all manuscripts from other institutions are provided in full in the first instance and, if mentioned again, abbreviated in following references.

⁷² This booklist is briefly discussed in Introduction 0.3; *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii*, Vol. 1, pp. 94–105.

⁷³ For the complete list of indicators ('Codes for Evidence') used for attribution, see *Corpus Catalogorum Belgii*, Vol. 7, pp. 11–12.

⁷⁴ Foliation is discussed in Chapter 4 of my study; bindings are discussed in Chapter 5.

of the total 554 (thus 383–444) to Ten Duinen.⁷⁵ This means that 20 to 30 per cent of the total manuscripts have been traditionally attributed to Ter Doest, and the remaining seventy to eighty percent to Ten Duinen. Derolez's findings present nearly the opposite: about one hundred manuscripts are demonstrably from Ten Duinen's library, and the remainder from Ter Doest.⁷⁶ While my study strives to present more precise dates and identifies some apparently missed incidents of Ten Duinen's trademark foliation as noted in the catalogue, it builds on the foundation laid by this work: having examined *in situ* at the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek all manuscripts attributed by Derolez to Ten Duinen and dated by him to the twelfth or first half of the thirteenth century, as well as several from Ter Doest, I appreciatively defer to and agree wholeheartedly with Derolez's attributions as published in 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?'

0.5 This Study's Methodology

This overview of the most relevant literature, as of the time of writing, demonstrates that there is a long history of scholarly research (and indeed public interest, as illustrated by cultural exhibitions) in the manuscripts of Ten Duinen. However, many aspects of the early scriptorium and library of the great abbey are still relatively unexplored, particularly in regard to the material features of their surviving books. There are no studies of this remarkably intact collection that synthesize the various discussions of its production and use since Lieftinck's contested monograph. Further, while the significant political and economic roles played by Ten Duinen have been addressed in some publications,⁷⁷ a profile of its early book production and ownership is warranted.

While Ten Duinen is recognized within Dutch-language scholarship, particularly within Flanders, it remains virtually unknown beyond the region. With no slight intended towards previous research, and with respect for the desire to maintain native-language scholarship and publication, Ten Duinen's anonymity may be a consequence of linguistic inaccessibility; to date, almost all mentions of the abbey's manuscripts are found in Dutch-language publications, with limited French exceptions. While lavish late-medieval Flemish manuscripts are celebrated in anglophone art history,⁷⁸ Flemish

⁷⁵ Huyghebaert, 'De bibliotheken van de abdijen van De Duinen en Ter Doest', p. 66; Hoste, *De Handschriften van Ter Doest*, p. 21; Isaac, *Les livres manuscrits de l'Abbaye des Dunes*, p. CCII; Derolez, 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?', 222–23.

⁷⁶ According to this study, a few manuscripts have uncertain origin and provenance: **Bruges, Openbare Bibliotheek, MSS 344** and **345** (Ter Doest?); **MSS 260** and **414**, and **Grootseminarie, MS 51/9** (Ten Duinen?)(258–77).

⁷⁷ Ten Duinen's size, economy, and political role are addressed broadly in both regionally focused and general Cistercian studies. See, for example, Hemptinne and Vandermaesen, 'De ambtenaren'; Jordan, 'Gender Concerns'; Lekai, *The Cistercians*; Williams, *The Cistercians*; Southern, *Western Society and the Church*.

⁷⁸ See, for example, 'Illuminating the Renaissance' (Los Angeles and London, 2003–2004, and virtually via the British Library website, ongoing), jointly organized by the J. Paul Getty Museum, the Royal Academy of Arts, London, and the British Library. A follow-up volume was also published: *Illuminating the Renaissance*, ed. by Kren and McKendrick.

manuscripts garner little extra-regional attention outside of art historical contexts.⁷⁹ I (ambitiously) hope to encourage broader accessibility to and interest in manuscripts of the Low Countries with my English-language study, particularly with respect to the High Middle Ages, and the region's underrepresented codicological and palaeographical features.

This study is undertaken with the guiding principles of quantitative codicology, a methodology whereby a feature or features of a manuscript corpus — of tens, hundreds, or even thousands — are analyzed, classified, and entered as retrievable data. By necessity, the data itself must be measurable and quantifiable; while not totally unbiased (as no human observation can be), quantitative codicology strives to reach findings that are verifiable and as objective as possible. Moreover, quantitative codicology enables findings that, due to the volume of manuscripts or features considered, could not have been as easily obtained, nor demonstrable, in the pre-digital era.⁸⁰ While some quantitative codicology studies indeed produce what can properly be called statistics by virtue of both the corpus size and use of statistical methods, many, including the present study, are less expansive.⁸¹

More specifically, in my adoption of quantitative codicology principles, my study's methodology is informed by that of Erik Kwakkel's project 'Turning Over a New Leaf'.⁸² Firstly, with shared research principles, I utilized a version of Kwakkel's digital database designed to collect data from images of 353 manuscripts in the *Catalogues manuscrits datés (CMD)*.⁸³ I then customized this foundation to include numerous data-entry fields for information gathered from *in situ* study of my manuscript corpus.⁸⁴ Where the 'Turning Over a New Leaf' database usually contains a single record per manuscript (as distinct codicological units are unaccounted for in the *CMD*, or images

⁷⁹ While an art-historical study, Hunt's *Illuminating the Borders of Northern French and Flemish Manuscripts, 1270–1310* bears mention for its earlier focus.

⁸⁰ The 1980 analysis of 6,200 manuscripts from the ninth through fourteenth centuries by Bonzollo and Ornato, *Pour une histoire du livre manuscrit au Moyen Âge: Trois essais de codicologie quantitative*, is usually credited as the first true quantitative codicology study. Earlier quantitative approaches exist: although his findings are flawed, Jones studied images of over a thousand of manuscripts for pricking patterns in the 1940s for his 'Pricking Manuscripts'. Still, Bonzollo and Ornato's method of systematic, retrievable, and verifiable research was groundbreaking. For a description of quantitative codicology principles and examples from the two decades since Bonzollo and Ornato's work, see Gumbert, 'Fifty Years of Codicology', 522–26.

⁸¹ Buringh's *Medieval Manuscript Production in the Latin West* is a broad quantitative study featuring some 30,000 Western manuscripts produced between 500 and 1500. It is, to my knowledge, the largest quantitative codicology study to date, and based on its methodology is perhaps best called statistical codicology (which, due to the stringent rules of statistical methods, very few studies can correctly claim to be).

⁸² The project, funded by the NWO (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek), was undertaken by team leader Erik Kwakkel with the support of PhD Jennifer A. Weston, and Postdoctoral Researcher Irene O'Daly from 1 May 2010 to 1 May 2015. My study can be considered a 'satellite' of this project.

⁸³ Kwakkel, 'Biting, Kissing and the Treatment of Feet', 112–25.

⁸⁴ Both 'Turning Over a New Leaf' and this study used database software FileMaker Pro to design a customized database in which to collect and retrieve data.

of each unit unavailable), my database makes a significant departure in providing a separate record for each 'manuscript unit'. The *CMD* sometimes contains only one or a few images of each manuscript, which does not, therefore, take into account the heterogeneous nature of many — if not most — manuscripts. That is, manuscripts are often composite: within a single binding, one may find sections copied by different scribes, at different times, and even in different scriptoria. Because the manuscripts included in this study were available in their entirety for comprehensive study, granting access to the variety of material grouped under a single shelfmark, a more specific reflection of these different parts was both possible and necessary.

Throughout this discussion of Ten Duinen's books, the term 'manuscript unit' is used in place of the less specific 'manuscript', unless the assessment allows (as, for example, when discussing the entire contents of a single binding or manuscripts more broadly). Manuscript units are distinguished from one another by a change of scribal hand, whether for a short or extended stretch (barring corrections, short insertions, and gloss), or a change of *mise en page* that, rather than the result of an error, is intentional and continuous.⁸⁵ Both conditions may, of course, occur simultaneously. As indicated, these changes can result from a wide variety of scenarios. For example: a change may take place as multiple scribes working at the same time copy a single text collaboratively; when scribes working at the same time produce two complementary texts to be bound together; when a scribe finishes copying his text, and another uses leftover space to add another text (whether on the next day, or years, decades, or even centuries later); when part of a text is lost or damaged, and another scribe inserts the missing text on a new folio or quire; or when different texts are copied at different times with no production relationship whatsoever, but are bound together in a later period. Presumably, other possible scenarios exist, and all might exist together within a single manuscript.

By collecting data on identifiable 'parts', it is furthermore easier to clearly and definitively exclude the data of those which do not meet my corpus criteria. For instance, the first part of **MS 109** contains a collection of Augustine's works from c. 1200 copied by a single scribe. It is, by the above criteria, a single manuscript unit. However, in the second quarter of the seventeenth century it was rebound together with complementary commentaries by Thomas Anglicus and Nicolas Trivet which were themselves copied in the fourteenth century. By considering these texts as distinct manuscript units, the later material is here discounted. So, although 'manuscript unit' may present itself as technical and unordinary, because of the vast array of potential production circumstances and the effects of later binding decisions on what reaches us today as a 'manuscript', this study errs on the side of pedantry for the sake of a more specific and accurate assessment of the unique manuscript units it explores.

⁸⁵ The latter distinction of a section according to dimensions or *mise en page* is essentially what Gumbert identifies as a 'codicological unit' in his 'Codicological Units: Towards a Terminology', 17–42.

Short ‘freehand’ (that is, unruled, unplanned, and informal) stretches of text such as those often found on flyleaves are here excluded, as are segments of texts found on recycled parchment as pastedowns and flyleaves. While worthy of attention elsewhere (especially perhaps the twelfth-century liturgical texts found in some early bindings, as noted in Chapters 2 and 5), they have major drawbacks for quantitative study: the amount of text available makes for a rather small palaeographical sample, and the representation of their original dimensions, layout, and evidence of use is marred.

Taking each manuscript unit individually, this study then relies strongly on the findings of a publication by Kwakkel in the early stages of ‘Turning Over a New Leaf’ which relied upon manuscripts in the *CMD* to track changes in palaeographical features over the course of the ‘Long Twelfth Century’ (c. 1075–c. 1225).⁸⁶ By analyzing dated manuscripts grouped by quarter century, Kwakkel demonstrates that changes in graphs — for example, the touching (‘kissing’) and eventual fusion (‘biting’) of commonly paired letters such as **pp** and **de** — occur with increasing frequency at particular times. By using the presence of these changes, together with codicological and known regional cues, it is possible to determine the approximate date of manuscripts with greater precision in a way that, because it is based on measurable traits, is verifiable.

Kwakkel’s dating method is groundbreaking in its accuracy; it was, after all, developed with data from dated manuscripts. It is not, however, a replacement for traditional palaeographical and codicological dating methods but is instead a strong support to established methods of dating and locating manuscripts. Traditional methods practiced and taught by great manuscript scholars such as Bernard Bischoff, J. P. Gumbert, and Albert Derolez are vital to developing the so-called ‘palaeographical eye’, or ‘scholarly intuition’ which are, in fact, wholly grounded in expertise and a great deal of experience. The skills on which traditional methods rely are, in my opinion, crystalized under the pressures of a rapt attention to detail, a robust visual memory, and the oversight of excellent teachers (as those listed have proven through their own scholarly legacies).

In summary, my study of Ten Duinen’s manuscripts benefits from both old and new approaches to manuscript research. I employ the principles of computer-aided quantitative codicology, as demonstrated through the processes of Kwakkel’s ‘Turning Over a New Leaf’ project, and rely on his findings to date my corpus manuscript units to the quarter century in which they were most likely to have been produced.⁸⁷ While seated in current practices, my study is firmly couched in traditional methods of observation and analysis developed by preeminent codicologists and palaeographers, a fraction of whose expertise I hope to have gained over years of formal and practical training.

⁸⁶ Kwakkel, ‘Biting, Kissing and the Treatment of Feet’, pp. 79–125, 206–208.

⁸⁷ Erik Kwakkel has also offered his expert opinion on the approximate dates of most of the manuscript units in my corpus; in the most challenging cases, I defer to his judgment.

0.6 This Study's Corpus

I have chosen 133 manuscript units for the corpus under investigation, each selected according to several criteria. Firstly, they were all created between c. 1126 and c. 1250.⁸⁸ As none of the manuscript units are dated,⁸⁹ the approximated dates are based on the principles described in the previous section. The initial boundary of the second quarter of the twelfth century reflects the earliest known material available from the library of Ten Duinen (barring a Carolingian copy of works by Boethius and Pseudo-Hucbald acquired after my study period), which coincides with the Cistercian conversion of Ten Duinen.⁹⁰ The latter boundary, the mid-thirteenth century, is based solely on the approximate date of a major change in the layout of the medieval page: the switch from writing the main text *above* the top ruled line, as had been done until mid-century, to writing *below* the top line, on the second ruled line.⁹¹ While this phenomenon is not strictly datable as a consequence of its occurring at different times in different places (and even at different times for different genres),⁹² and perhaps gradually within individual scriptoria, it offers an easily identified *terminus ante quem* for the handwritten books of this study. Palaeographical evidence indicates that this transition happened around the mid-thirteenth century within Ten Duinen's scriptorium; of the numerous manuscripts viewed and subsequently excluded on the basis of this criteria, all books written below top line were almost certainly copied in the second half of the thirteenth century based on the degree of letter fusion and other Gothic qualities.⁹³

Second, my corpus is limited to manuscripts held in the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek's Historisch Fonds: not only does this include nearly all of the known books

⁸⁸ It may seem odd to use c. 1126 instead of c. 1125, but it is used because, in the following chapters, each manuscript unit is dated by quarter century: c. 1126–c. 1150, c. 1151–c. 1175, c. 1176–c. 1200, c. 1201–c. 1225, and c. 1226–c. 1250. Although approximate dates, each manuscript unit is assigned a single quarter century date range in my database, which was necessary for quantitative analysis.

⁸⁹ There is one manuscript that contains two dates: **MS 378**. It was copied by an identified scribe in Rheims known as Garnerus. One date, 1189, is found on f. 1^v and refers to events during the reign of Pope Clement III. Another, 1243, is found on both an early modern table of contents on the verso of the opening flyleaf and the contents added by Carolus de Visch on f. 1^r. It refers to the date of the very short *dictamen* of Pope Innocent IX to the General Chapter added to ff. 83^r–83^v in the space leftover from copying the main text, now known as the *Decretalium collectio Brugensis* (also found in **MS 379**).

⁹⁰ According to Geirnaert, '26. Bernardus van Clairvaux, Werken', p. 146, **Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.1.17** may be the oldest surviving Ten Duinen manuscript; it contains both Ten Duinen foliation and an early thirteenth-century ownership inscription. It remained in the abbey library until at least the production of de Visch's catalogue, in which it is recorded. No images are available, and funding did not permit travel for *in situ* study, thus no further assessment is offered here.

⁹¹ On this change, see Ker, 'From 'Above Top Line' to 'Below Top Line''.

⁹² Insofar as I know, no published quantitative study has investigated the progression of writing above top line to writing below top line. Observationally, however, it appears that the transition may have begun in glossed manuscripts in the second quarter of the thirteenth century: the main text was increasingly written below the top line, while planned gloss was written above.

⁹³ On Gothic script, see Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books*, esp. pp. 56–65. For a quantitative study on the development of some of these Gothic features, see Kwakkel, *Kissing, Biting and the Treatment of Feet*.

of Ten Duinen's surviving library from the period studied,⁹⁴ but it also benefits from a number of other practicalities. A corpus located within a single institution, and one offering particularly kind cooperation, enabled me to carry out *in situ* research with the required efficiency and economy.⁹⁵ Moreover, the Openbare Bibliotheek's online catalogue, with digital facsimiles of some manuscripts, proved a useful reference tool which in most cases includes at least basic codicological information and a limited bibliography as it undergoes expansion.

My corpus selection was also largely based on Derolez's attribution of manuscripts to the library of Ten Duinen; this includes both manuscript units made by the monks of the abbey themselves and retained in their collection, and units made at other monasteries or production centres and acquired — by donation, purchase, or trade, although the means is almost never known — and retained in the library through subsequent centuries. If included in Derolez's 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?' and dated there to the twelfth or thirteenth century (unless expressly indicated to be of the second half of the thirteenth century) it has been assessed *in situ*. Of the 133 manuscript units in my corpus, fifty-five are here attributed to Ten Duinen, and the remaining seventy-eight determined to be acquired from elsewhere.

Because of the broad date ranges offered, a number of manuscripts listed by Derolez have been viewed and, determined to be beyond the scope of this study, excluded from my corpus. Other manuscripts of the period studied but containing overt evidence, such as ownership or donation inscriptions, that indicate they were acquired centuries later are likewise excluded; while their data could contribute to evidence of production and use trends outside the abbey, they cannot have influenced the abbey's own production or use in the period in question which is, after all, the primary focus of my study. There are also cases in which I have found internal evidence that, although Derolez has not attributed a manuscript to Ten Duinen's library, it should indeed be ascribed to the abbey. This includes, for example, **MSS 147, 257, and 277**, which all contain Ten Duinen's characteristic thirteenth-century foliation (discussed primarily in Chapter 4). Designation of manuscript units as products of Ten Duinen's scriptorium, or alternatively as originating outside the abbey, is based on palaeographical and codicological evidence (as described in each chapter of this study), as well as the assessments of other scholars where cited.

⁹⁴ The Grootseminarie in Bruges holds few early manuscripts. The findings of a significant amount of research conclude that **Bruges, Grootseminarie, MS 89/54** is most certainly a Ten Duinen book. Although digitized, its images are not high resolution enough to be used for the type of research performed in this dissertation. Two other shelfmarks, **GS, MSS 23/48** and **107/62** may also be Ten Duinen books of the studied period: Derolez, 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest', 275, marks them as thirteenth century (without further precision) and twelfth through fourteenth century, respectively.

⁹⁵ All manuscripts included in my corpus, as well as many eventually excluded based on dating criteria, were viewed *in situ* except for two: **MSS 128** and **130**. A collection of images showing bindings and various samples of each scribal hand were kindly provided by Evelien Hauwaerts of the Openbare Bibliotheek.

0.7 Chapter Outline

This study is concerned with both the production and the use of books at Ten Duinen in roughly the first century of their foundation as a Cistercian house, c. 1126 to c. 1250. The precise driving forces behind why certain texts were copied or how they were interpreted at the abbey are not of particular concern here. Instead, I seek to explore Ten Duinen's books as material objects: the supplies and techniques used to build their physical structure, both inside and out; the specific aesthetic choices made to produce a particular final appearance; and the various features added to make their contents optimally accessible and appealing to the reader. Moreover, while some motivations for these choices made at different stages of production and use are sometimes lost to us now, where possible, my suggestions of why certain features and techniques were chosen are offered. This book is divided into seven units: introduction, five chapters, and a brief synthesizing conclusion. The chapters keep to a basic scheme of codicology, palaeography, reading aids and evidence of use, and finally, bindings. They are, however, divided with a little more nuance to ensure information is offered in more or less balanced, digestible portions.

The first chapter of my study focuses on the earliest stages of book production, exploring processes and techniques which transition the fundamental material of twelfth- and thirteenth century books — parchment — from animal to manuscript. Moreover, it describes the codicological features produced by these preparation steps: it assesses the appearance and dimensions of the parchment in my corpus's manuscript units; the methods and locations of pricking used as a guide for ruling the textblock; the ruling techniques and patterns laid out and the resulting proportion designated to textblock versus margin; and finally the arrangement of these prepared parchment folios into quires. These aspects are explored both in manuscripts made at Ten Duinen and in those which the abbey acquired for their library from elsewhere; the presence of several features is quantified, and some are compared in regard to their occurrence and prevalence over time. Further, the occurrence of some features is compared based on manuscript unit origin to identify where Ten Duinen's scriptorium may have adopted different bookmaking practices than their peers working at other production centres, and some suggestions of why Ten Duinen's scribes made the particular decisions they did are offered.

Chapter 2 zeros in on the next stage of book production: copying the text. After an overview of a small selection of Ten Duinen's texts for which transmission can be pieced together, this chapter locates scribes whose work survives in more than one manuscript unit and those who worked within the abbey's scriptorium within the same generation. As there is no identifiable script house style practiced at the abbey, this chapter instead pinpoints the characteristics of specific hands to reconstruct small glimpses into the activity of the abbey's scribe-monks at different moments within the period studied. In doing so, Chapter 2 also explores the different roles these scribes

may have played within their workshop as copyists, correctors, rubricators, and even decorators.

The manuscripts' intended or practical use (or uses) as evidenced by two types of reading aids — interpretative and navigational — are addressed in Chapters 3 and 4. Here, different types of reading aids are described and classified according to their primary functions of helping the reader either understand the meaning of the text, or locate particular topics or important sections within it. Chapter 3 concludes with a brief assessment of the marginal notation found within the manuscripts owned by Ten Duinen's community, finding that it is perhaps especially sparse, and suggests why the practice was apparently not embraced by the abbey's readers. Among other navigational aids, Chapter 4 takes a closer look at Ten Duinen's foliation (perhaps the best-known feature of the abbey's books), and considers evidence overlooked in previous publications to propose a revised date for its application.

Finally, a brief study of the bindings, particularly those of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, is attempted. While often excluded in codicological studies, one of the most remarkable aspects of Ten Duinen's manuscripts is the survival of original or early bindings boasting somewhat uncommon techniques of covering the oak boards with hairy leather, horn-plated title fenestrae, remnants of chain clasps, and a distinctive (now enigmatic) shelfmark system that must have once enabled Ten Duinen's monks to locate specific books in their library. Moreover, a large proportion of the abbey's manuscripts were rebound in the first half of the seventeenth century. They then gained new tables of contents written by Carolus de Visch which reflects a continued or renewed interest in preserving the manuscripts collected by the abbey's brothers centuries before.

As a whole, the different features of the manuscripts analyzed in this study can be considered as analogous to an abbey itself. As with a building's foundation, the parchment must be adequately prepared to ensure longevity and stability; it is the base upon which the whole construction stands. The layout and arrangement of folios act in the way of a building's frame and beams, ensuring both aesthetic and functional needs are met in order to provide the required structure. Text, like a building's walls, is added to the framework laid out; the script that best fulfills the task is chosen, as building materials are selected to best suit the environment. As an abbey is hardly considered complete until it houses monks, a book is not truly such until it has been filled with words. Reading aids are added, like furniture to rooms, to enhance the book's use and to distinguish one section from the next. Lastly, the binding might be compared to a roof: often needing repairs and maintenance from the wears and tears of its role, it protects the manuscript's contents from the elements, ensuring what is kept inside survives generations. Although the medieval abbey of Ten Duinen itself is lost, this study of its surviving manuscripts provides insight into some elements of daily life — the creation, collection, and use of books — that occurred within its walls in its early days.

Albert Derolez acknowledged the great challenge G. I. Lieftinck faced in studying the early scriptoria and libraries of Ten Duinen and Ter Doest, particularly in regard to addressing the origins of the surviving manuscripts due to their physical similarities and the amalgamation of the two libraries in seventeenth-century Bruges. Derolez also noted that because of this difficulty, no one had since attempted to follow up on his study.⁹⁶ Derolez himself has successfully resolved this great challenge, and Ter Doest's manuscripts have enjoyed the specific attentions of Hoste.⁹⁷ With this dissertation, I aim to contribute to the body of knowledge about the early manuscripts of Ten Duinen by filling in remaining gaps, resolving conjecture with evidence, and presenting new findings. According to the sentiment of Bernard of Chartres,⁹⁸ I stand on the shoulders of those giants who have undertaken such research before me, to build a more complete profile of Ten Duinen's early scriptorium and library as vital elements of the abbey's intellectual and cultural life.

⁹⁶ Derolez, 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?', 221–22.

⁹⁷ Hoste, *De Handschriften van Ter Doest*.

⁹⁸ 'Dicebat Bernardus Carnotensis nos esse quasi nanos, gigantium humeris insidentes, ut possimus plura eis et remotiora videre, non utique proprii visus acumine, aut eminentia corporis, sed quia in altum subvenimur et extollimur magnitudine gigantea'. John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 3.4, ed. by Webb, p. 136.