



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

APPENDIX A

CORPUS MANUSCRIPTS

The following table includes basic information about each manuscript unit in the corpus I compiled for my study of Ten Duinen's twelfth- and early thirteenth-century books. All manuscripts are held by the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek; there are fifty-seven manuscripts, and 133 manuscript units. Manuscript units within the same manuscript are distinguished from one another by a scribal change, codicological differences (for example, different ruling patterns), or both, as outlined in Introduction 0.6. The folios of each manuscript unit, determined through *in situ* study, are provided in the second column. Approximate date by quarter century is found in the third column, which is based on palaeographical analysis using the methodology outlined in Introduction 0.5. When units within the same manuscript have different dates, it usually indicates that the manuscripts are composite, i.e. made up of separate texts by different scribes, in these cases copied at different times and later bound together. There are, however, rare cases where manuscript units were likely made at or near the same production moment, but their scribes are of different generations; older scribes can thus exhibit the scribal trends of the time at which they were trained instead of that of their younger colleagues.

Contents, in Latin, are recorded for each manuscript unit. They follow those listed by De Poorter's *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Bruges*, and thus also reflect those listed by the Openbare Bibliotheek's online catalogue entry for each manuscript. A breakdown of each manuscript's texts by folio, as well as the incipits and explicits, can also be found in De Poorter's *Catalogue*. Most of this information is likewise available in the Openbare Bibliotheek's online catalogue and is therefore excluded here.

As dimensions and pricking are significant to Chapter 2's findings, they are included in columns 5 and 6. In many cases manuscript units also feature pricking for the vertical bounding lines in the top and bottom margins; this data is excluded here as it bears little relevance for this study's findings. As demonstrated in Chapter 2, Part B, inner margin pricking is particularly common at Ten Duinen. While outer margin pricking alone is more common in general, if it is not listed here it has been removed by trimming. Where 'some' qualifies inner margin pricking, it means that it is featured in some, but not all, quires in that manuscript unit. Where 'some' qualifies outer margin pricking, it means that it has only sometimes survived the binder's knife and appears sparingly.

The origins of acquired manuscript units are, for the most part, unknown. Where palaeographical evidence suggests the scribe has been trained in a particular region, it is cautiously forwarded here. Occasionally literature offering origin is cited in this column, as are notes of features indicating ownership at or near the period studied,

such as early ownership inscriptions. Manuscript units attributed to Ten Duinen's scriptorium are also labelled, and a brief justification for their attribution provided. The strongest evidence is an identified scribe, listed here according to their designations in Chapter 2. Lengthy reasoning for the attribution of each manuscript unit is not offered, but is generalized according to the study's extensively collected data: 'codicological features' indicates that a number of characteristics are present that together suggest origin at Ten Duinen, as evidenced by their commonality among those units which are known and likeliest to have been made at the abbey. Chief among these characteristics are the appearance, hand, and texture of the parchment; style of quire signatures; size of folios and large margin proportions; and inner margin pricking. Additional indicators are initial style (simple, sometimes unusually shaped red, blue, and occasionally green initials in the twelfth century, and foliate mono- or duo-chrome initials in the early thirteenth century), and bindings. Links with other manuscript units (for example, where a manuscript unit is a direct copy of another, or a manuscript is one of multiple volumes in a set, or produced as a complementary volume to another) are also indicated as they often further establish origin.

The presence of medieval foliation is noted in the penultimate column; most is carried out in Ten Duinen's own unique style, but there are also cases of Roman numeral foliation, some of which may have also originated at Ten Duinen (see Chapter 4.7). In rare cases Ten Duinen's foliation is found, usually as a few small red traces in trimmed corners, where it is not recorded by Derolez's 'Ten Duinen of Ter Doest?' or in the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek's online catalogue.

While a few manuscripts do not have their own specific mention in my study, they are nonetheless factored into quantitative studies and overall impressions which inform its arguments and findings.

MS	Unit Folios	Date by Quarter Century	Contents	Dimensions (Textblock)	Horizontal Pricking	Origin	Medieval Foliation
9	1 ^r –108 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Iudicum, Ruth, Regum, Paralipomenon</i>	455 x 316 (378 x 235)	Inner	Unknown. Complements MS 33	None
10	1 ^v –49 [?]	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Liber Salomonis, Ecclesiastes, Canticum canticorum, Sapientia, Sirach</i>	235 x 155 (196 x 124)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	49 [?] –112 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Iob, Tobias, Iudith, Hester, Ezras, Macchabaeorum, Prologi Hieronymi in Biblia sacra</i>	235 x 155 (196 x 124)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
15	1 ^r –128 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Quaestiones in vetus testamentum, Isidore of Seville</i>	235 x 165 (183 x 113)	Outer	Unknown. English? palaeographical features	Ten Duinen
17	1 ^v –87 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>In Leviticum, Rodulfus Tortarius</i>	364 x 260 (270 x 190)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials same as MS 19	Ten Duinen
19	1 ^r –154 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>In Leviticum, Rodulfus Tortarius</i>	367 x 266 (265 x 181)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials same as MS 17, binding, 13 th -c. ownership inscription f. 154 ^v	Ten Duinen
27	3 ^r –72 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>In proverbias Salomonis, Bede</i>	250 x 174 (178 x 110)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Scribe D, binding	Ten Duinen
	72 ^v –125 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>In proverbias Salomonis, Bede</i>	250 x 174 (178 x 110)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Scribe E (perhaps trained in England) shares quire with and is contemporary corrector of Scribe D, binding	Ten Duinen

	2 ^v –21 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Sermones</i> , Stephen of Canterbury	367 x 260 (292 x 203)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, 13 th -c. <i>fenestra</i> label	Ten Duinen
	22 ^r –28 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Sermones</i> (3), <i>Liber poenitentialis</i>	367 x 260 (272 x 190)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, 13 th -c. <i>fenestra</i> label	Ten Duinen
28	28 ^v –34 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Liber poenitentialis</i> , <i>Eulogia St Agnes</i>	364 x 260 (272 x 190)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Shares quire with ff. 22 ^r –28 ^v	Ten Duinen
	35 ^r –133 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Notule magistri Stephani archiepiscopi Cantuariensis super quattuor libros Regum, Super librum Iudith, Sermones</i> (3), <i>Super Parabolas Salomonis</i>	364 x 260 (254 x 176)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, 13 th -c. <i>fenestra</i> label	Ten Duinen
	133 ^v –174 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Super Parabolas Salomonis</i> , short moralizing tracts (2)	364 x 260 (254 x 176)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Shares quire with ff. 35 ^r –133 ^r	Ten Duinen
	1 ^r –16 ^r 16 ^v –64 ^v 69 ^r –181 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Iob, Liber Salomonis, Ecclesiastes, Canticum canticorum, Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Hieremias, Threni, Hiezechiel, Danihel, Prophetae</i>	452 x 325 (367 x 230)	Inner Outer	Unknown. Complements MS 9, same scribe	None
33	16 ^r –16 ^v 42 ^v –43 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Liber Salomonis</i> (chapter table), <i>Ecclesiasticus</i> (chapter table)	452 x 325 (367 x 230)	Inner Outer	Unknown. Complements MS 9	None
	65 ^r –68 ^v ; 182 ^r –187 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Baruch, Prophetae</i>	364 x 260 (270 x 190)	Inner Outer	Unknown. Complements MS 9	None
47	1 ^r –111 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>In Psalmos (prima pars)</i> , Gilbert of Poitiers	260 x 180 (197 x 138)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Scribe F, codicological features, initials. Complements MS 48	Ten Duinen

48	1 ^r –88 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>In Psalmos (secunda pars)</i> , Gilbert of Poitiers	250 x 178 (197 x 138)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Scribe F, codicological features, initials. Complements MS 47	Ten Duinen
51	1 ^r –54 ^v 65 ^r –74 ^v	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Flores Psalmorum</i> , Libert of Lille	310 x 226 (256 x 185)	None	Ten Duinen. Contemporary ownership inscription f. 164 ^v	Ten Duinen
	55 ^r –65 ^v	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Flores Psalmorum</i> , Libert of Lille	310 x 226 (260 x 185)	None	Ten Duinen	Ten Duinen
	75 ^r –164 ^r	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Flores Psalmorum</i> , Libert of Lille	310 x 226 (260 x 185)	None	Ten Duinen	Ten Duinen
55	1 ^r –72 ^v	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Mattheus glossatus</i> , Jerome	265 x 167 (195 x 147)	Outer	Unknown. Southern France?	Ten Duinen
	73 ^r –101 ^v	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Expositio in Apocalipsim</i>	265 x 156 (242 x 148)	Outer	Unknown	None
	102 ^r –117 ^v	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Vita Guillelmi</i> (and prayers)	255 x 156 (212 x 122)	Outer	Unknown	None
56	2 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	List of readings from Matthew for Sundays and feast days	246 x 153 (185 x 115)	None	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	3 ^r –56 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>In Mattheum</i> , Geoffrey Babion	250 x 156 (210 x 110)	Outer	Unknown	Roman numerals
	56 ^r –100 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>In Mattheum</i> , Geoffrey Babion	250 x 156 (210 x 110)	Outer	Unknown	Roman numerals
	101 ^r –126 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>In Mattheum</i> , Geoffrey Babion	250 x 156 (210 x 110)	Outer	Ten Duinen. May be Scribe E of MS 27	Roman numerals
	127 ^r –188 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Mattheus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	250 x 156 (200 x 140)	None	Unknown. Gift of Walter de Haltere	Roman numerals
	188 ^v –189 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Mattheus glossatus (ordinaria)</i> (chapter table)	250 x 156 (210 x 150)	None	Unknown. Gift of Walter de Haltere, see f. 189v	Roman numerals

59	1 ^r –8 ^v 11 ^r –18 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Mattheus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	248 x 173 (173 x 163)	Outer	Unknown	None
	9 ^r –10 ^v (misbound)	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Mattheus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	248 x 173 (223 x 150)	Outer	Unknown	None
	59 ^r –74 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Mattheus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	248 x 173 (173 x 153)	Outer	Unknown	None
62	4 ^r –78 ^v	c. 1226–c. 1250	<i>Mattheus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	270 x 190 (190 x 135)	None	Unknown	None
	79 ^r –137 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Lucas glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	270 x 190 (192 x 140)	Outer	Unknown	Roman numerals
67	1 ^r –66 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Marcus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	308 x 215 (207 x 155)	Inner	Unknown	None
	67 ^r –148 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Iohannes glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	270 x 190 (192 x 140)	Inner	Unknown	None
72	1 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	Chapter table	256 x 168 (190 x 125)	Outer	Unknown	Roman numerals
	2 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Marcus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	258 x 170 (198 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	None
	2 ^r –2 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Marcus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	258 x 170 (198 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	None
	3 ^r –62 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Marcus glossatus (ordinaria)</i>	258 x 175 (195 x 140)	Outer	Unknown	Roman numerals
	63 ^r –103 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>In Lamentations Hieremiae</i> , Gilbert Universalis	258 x 175 (220 x 150)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials	None
79	1 ^r –168 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Excerpta ex commentariis Augustini in Epistolas Pauli</i> , Florus of Lyon	345 x 255 (265 x 180)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials, 13 th -c. ownership inscription f. 168 ^r . Complements MS 82	Ten Duinen

82	1 ^r –5 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Excerpta ex commentariis Augustini in Epistolae Pauli</i> , Florus of Lyon	345 x 245 (260 x 170)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials. Complements MS 79	Ten Duinen
	5 ^v –180 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Excerpta ex commentariis Augustini in Epistolae Pauli</i> , Florus of Lyon	345 x 245 (260 x 170)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials. Complements MS 79	Ten Duinen
83	1 ^v –2 ^v 4 ^v –5 ^r	c. 1126–c. 1150	Passages from New Testament with citations from Jerome, Origen, et al.; <i>Versus de mysterio missae</i> , Hildebert of Lavardin	250 x 160 (205 x 140)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	3 ^r –4 ^r	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Epistolae sancti Pauli cum glossa</i>	250 x 160 (190 x 126)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen, Roman numerals
	5 ^v –31 ^v	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Epistolae sancti Pauli cum glossa</i>	250 x 160 (180 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen, Roman numerals
	32 ^r –118 ^v	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Epistolae sancti Pauli cum glossa</i>	250 x 160 (180 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen, Roman numerals
	119 ^r –138 ^r	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Epistolae sancti Pauli cum glossa</i>	250 x 160 (180 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen, Roman numerals
88	119 ^r –138 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Exceptiones ex opusculis sancti Gregorii papae</i>	317 x 235 (268 x 177)	Inner	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials	Ten Duinen

	1 ^r –9 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Allegoriae quinque librorum Moysi</i> , Richard of St-Victor	275 x 200 (230 x 150)	Outer	Unknown	None
	10 ^r –33 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Allegoriae quinque librorum Moysi</i> , Richard of St-Victor	280 x 195 (230 x 150)	Some inner Outer	Unknown	None
	34 ^r –52 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Sermones varii</i> , Stephen Langton	280 x 195 (250 x 160)	Outer	Unknown	None
	53 ^r –54 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Allegoriae</i>	280 x 195 (230 x 155)	Inner Outer	Unknown	None
93	54 ^v –81 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Allegoriae; Allegoria super evangelium</i> , Richard of St-Victor; Miracles of St Remigius	280 x 195 (230 x 160)	Some inner Some outer	Unknown	None
	82 ^r –87 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Sermones</i> (7 on 'Parce mihi Domine')	280 x 195 (225 x 140)	None	Unknown	None
	88 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Liber poenitentialis</i> , Alain of Lille	265 x 175 (220 x 150)	Outer	Unknown	None
	88 ^r –100 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Liber poenitentialis</i> , Alain of Lille	265 x 175 (220 x 150)	Outer	Unknown	None
	100 ^r –101 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Sermones</i> (3), <i>In Proverbia</i> (31:10, 29:13)	275 x 175 (215 x 155)	None	Unknown	None
	102 ^r –102 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>In Psalmos</i> (36:27), <i>In epistula II ad Corinthios</i> (5:6)	280 x 185 (220 x 155)	Inner Outer	Unknown	None
102	1 ^r –129 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Hexameron, Commentum super Cantica canticorum</i> , Ambrose; <i>Epistolae Pauli ad Laodicenses; Baruch; Exemplum eiusdem epistulae quam misit Ieremias ...</i>	245 x 170 (190 x 137)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials, binding, c. 1300 ownership inscription f. 129 ^v	Ten Duinen
105	1 ^v –149 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Opera varii</i> , Augustine	345 x 238 (240 x 165)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Scribe G, codicological features, initials, binding. Complements MSS 109, 111, and 118	Ten Duinen

109	1 ^r –87 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Opera varii</i> , Augustine	337 x 240 (243 x 162)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Scribe G, codicological features, initials. Complements MSS 105, 111, and 118	Ten Duinen
111	1 ^v –155 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Contra Faustum Manichaeum</i> , Augustine	354 x 260 (260 x 185)	Inner	Ten Duinen. Scribe G, codicological features, initials. Complements MSS 105, 109, and 118	Ten Duinen
116	2 ^r –158 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>De quantitate animae, Soliloquiorum libri duo, De libero arbitrio</i> , Augustine; fragments about Plagues of Egypt, Creation; <i>De annis incarnationis Domini; De sorte cuiusdam episcopi de xv christianis totidemque Iudeis</i>	280 x 185 (220 x 155)	Outer	Unknown. German palaeographical features, initials	Ten Duinen
	158 ^v –159 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	List of Augustine's works	280 x 185 (220 x 155)	Outer	Unknown. German palaeographical features	None
118	1 ^r –187 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Liber sancti Augustini de vera fide</i> , Fulgentius of Ruspe, <i>Opera varii</i> , Augustine	333 x 235 (242 x 162)	Inner	Ten Duinen. Scribe G, codicological features, initials. Complements MSS 105, 109, and 118	Ten Duinen
120	1 ^r –112 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De fide catholica, Contra Sabellium</i> , Athanasius; <i>Arrium et Fotinum</i> , Vigilius of Thapsis; <i>Tractatus de incomprehensibili dominicae incarnationis et humanae redemptionis sacramento</i>	280 x 185 (220 x 155)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, binding, 12 th -c. ownership inscription f. 112 ^v	Ten Duinen

128	1 ^r –49 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>De gradibus humilitatis et superbia, Sententiae</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux; <i>Expositio orationis dominica</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux?	280 x 185 (220 x 155)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials	Ten Duinen
	50 ^r –140 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Soliloquia, seu potius Prefatio ad librum de amore Dei, De arte amoris</i> , William of St-Thierry; <i>Quot sunt status amoris in anima christiana</i> , Anon.	230 x 160 (180 x 120)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials	Ten Duinen
130	1 ^v –8 ^v	c. 1226–c. 1250	Chapter tables	190 x 140 (140 x 100)	Outer	Ten Duinen. References rest of volume	None
	10 ^r –108 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De consideratione</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux	190 x 140 (145 x 100)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, binding	Ten Duinen Roman numerals (= MS 152)
	108 ^v –109 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Pulchre locutionis reciprocatio inter Deum et animam</i> , Anon.	190 x 140 (145 x 100)	None	Ten Duinen. Shares folio with MS 130, ff. 10 ^r –108 ^r	Ten Duinen Roman numerals (= MS 152)
	109 ^v –112 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Miracula domini Eugenii papae III, De sacerdote qui viro Dei corripienti se detrahebat</i> , Anon.	190 x 140 (145 x 100)	None	Ten Duinen. Shares folio with MS 130, ff. 108 ^v –109 ^r	Ten Duinen Roman numerals (= MS 152)
131	2 ^r –17 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Regula pauperum commilitonum sanctae civitatis</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux	245 x 170 (195 x 115)	None	Clairvaux? (Bruges OB online catalogue). 13 th -c. ownership inscription f. 1 ^v	Ten Duinen
	18 ^r –55 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De laude novae militia, Liber apologeticus Bernardi abbatis ad dominum Willem abbatem Sancti Theoderici</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux	245 x 170 (190 x 140)	Outer	Clairvaux? (Bruges OB online catalogue)	Ten Duinen

	55 ^v –83 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Epistula Willelmi quondam abbatis Sancti Theoderici ad fratres de Monte Dei</i> , William of St-Thierry	245 x 170 (190 x 140)	Some inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, initials	Ten Duinen
131 (cont.)	84 ^r –120 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Scriptum quoddam fratris Geroch ad Bernardus abbatis de simonia, Epistulae cuiusdam heremite ad Rainardum morimundensem abbatem</i> , Gerhoh of Reichersberg	245 x 170 (190 x 135)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
	121 ^r –158 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Liber primus Petri cluniacensis ad dampnum Bernardum clarevallensem abbatem ...</i> , Peter the Venerable	230 x 160 (180 x 120)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
132	1 ^r –110 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Epistulae</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux	233 x 152 (193 x 106)	Outer	Unknown	None
139	1 ^v –86 ^r	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Monita sancti Effrem</i> , Ephrem the Syrian; <i>Acta sancti Iohannis Alexandrini episcopi</i> , Leontios of Neapolis	283 x 194 (248 x 140)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
147	1 ^r –190 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Super cantica, Super orationem dominicam</i> , Gilbert of Hoyland; <i>Super symbolum</i> , Simon of Tournay	290 x 208 (210 x 145)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
	1 ^v –78 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De archa Noe, De archa Sapientiae, De archa Ecclesiae, De archa Matris gratiae, Libellus de formatione arche</i> , Hugh of St-Victor	226 x 160 (178 x 110)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, binding	Ten Duinen, Roman numerals (= MS 130)
152	79 ^r –80 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	Chapter table	226 x 160 (178 x 118)	Outer	Ten Duinen	Ten Duinen, Roman numerals
	82 ^r –139 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De duodecim patriarchis</i> , Richard of St-Victor	226 x 160 (178 x 118)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, binding	Ten Duinen, Roman numerals

156	1 ^r –132 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Opera varii</i> , Hugh of St-Victor	190 x 150 (136 x 100)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, 13 th -c. ownership inscription f. 132 ^v	Ten Duinen
	1 ^v –24 ^v 53 ^v –54 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Opera varii</i> , Origen	225 x 150 (168 x 105)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
158	25 ^r –53 ^r	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Opera varii</i> , Origen	225 x 150 (168 x 105)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	54 ^v –76 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Opera varii</i> , Origen; <i>Septem mulieres</i> , Anon.	225 x 150 (188 x 110)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	76 ^v –78 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	Commentary on Ezekiel, Anon.	225 x 150 (188 x 110)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	78 ^v –79 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	Various patristic quotes	225 x 150 (188 x 110)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	79 ^r –80 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	Various patristic quotes	225 x 150 (188 x 110)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	81 ^r –126 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Praedestinatus</i> , Arnobius the Younger	227 x 150 (196 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	126 ^r –127 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Gloss in prefatione</i> , Jerome	227 x 150 (196 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
	127 ^r –127 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Ad Cunradum regem Romanorum</i> , <i>Ad Romanos</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux	227 x 160 (200 x 130)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
161	1 ^r –25 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De summo bono</i> , Isidore of Seville	308 x 212 (250 x 168)	None	Ten Duinen. Codicological features. Corrector on f. 8 ^v may be hand of Bruges, GS, 89/54	Ten Duinen
	25 ^v –56 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De summo bono</i> , Isidore of Seville	308 x 212 (250 x 168)	None	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
	56 ^v –149 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Exceptiones de libris sancti Augustini</i> , Augustine; <i>Hortus deliciarum</i> , Herrad of Landsberg	308 x 212 (250 x 168)	None	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, shared folio with ff. 25 ^v –56 ^v	Ten Duinen
	149 ^r –152 ^r	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>Excerpta varia</i>	308 x 212 (262 x 170)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, shared folio with ff. 56 ^v –149 ^r	Ten Duinen

163	1 ^r -192 ^v	c. 1176-c. 1200	<i>Etymologiae</i> , Isidore of Seville; <i>Subterraneo meatu</i> , Ps.-Censorinus; <i>De celo vel quinque circulis eius</i> , Bede; short anon. prayer	370 x 195 (215 x 130)	None	Unknown. Southern France? palaeographical features	Ten Duinen
166	1 ^v -195 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>In libro de viris illustribus</i> , Jerome; <i>Firmiani Lactantii divinarum institutionum adversus gentes libri septem</i> , Lactantius; <i>In libro XX de civitate Dei</i> , Augustine; <i>Liber Firmiani Lactantii de ira Dei</i> , <i>De formatione hominis</i> , Lactantius	308 x 212 (262 x 170)	Inner Outer	Unknown	None
183	1 ^r -104 ^v	c. 1176-c. 1200	<i>Sententiae liber IV</i> , Peter Lombard	346 x 244 (250 x 163)	Inner Outer	Unknown. English? (Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', p. 71)	None
233	1 ^v -125 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>Sententiae (varia)</i> , Peter Lombard	338 x 235 (245 x 165)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, <i>fenestra</i> label (f. 1 ^o)	Ten Duinen
234	1 ^r -157 ^v	c. 1176-c. 1200	<i>Distinctiones</i> , Peter Cantor	147 x 113 (117 x 90)	Outer	Unknown	None
	1 ^r -143 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>Sermones de Verbis Domini et Apostoli</i> , Augustine, Ps.-Augustine	400 x 297 (310 x 220)	Inner Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
257	144 ^r -249 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>Historia scholastica</i> , Peter Comestor	400 x 297 (315 x 218)	Inner	Unknown English? initials, e.g. ff. 210 ^v , 234 ^r . Scribe may be that of MSS 130 bis and/or 400 (Ter Doest)	Ten Duinen

	2 ^r –129 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Sermones</i> , Peter Damian; Various patristic quotes	296 x 195 (227 x 153)	Some inner Some outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features. Missing folios w/ text loss prior to foliation, later subject index using foliation	Ten Duinen
277	130 ^r –139 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>De tabernaculo Moysi</i> , Anon.	296 x 195 (227 x 153)	Some inner Some outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
	140 ^r –140 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>De tabernaculo Moysi</i> , Anon.	296 x 195 (227 x 150)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
	141 ^r –148 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>De tabernaculo Moysi</i> , on readings of the liturgical year, on Holy Week, Anon.	296 x 195 (227 x 150)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
	150 ^r –153 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Sermones</i> (2), Anon.	296 x 195 (227 x 153)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features	Ten Duinen
280	1 ^r –135 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Speculum ecclesiae</i> , Honorius of Autun	240 x 160 (190 x 137)	Inner Outer	Unknown. 13 th /14 th -c. ownership inscription f. 135 ^v	Ten Duinen
283	1 ^r –184 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Homeliae in dominicas totius annii</i> , John Halgren of Abbeville	210 x 156 (175 x 120)	Outer	Unknown	Ten Duinen
284	1 ^r –7 ^v	c. 1226–c. 1250	<i>Varia</i> , Seneca, Ps.-Seneca	145 x 100 (120 x 79)	None	Unknown	None
	8 ^r –41 ^v	c. 1226–c. 1250	<i>Patristic varia</i> ; <i>Excerpta</i> , Bernard of Clairvaux	145 x 100 (120 x 85)	None	Unknown	None
	57 ^r –240 ^v	c. 1226–c. 1250	Various sermons, prayers, excerpts, mostly anon.	145 x 100 (106 x 90)	None	Unknown	None
285	1 ^r –62 ^v	c. 1176–c. 1200	<i>Sermones</i> , Caesarius of Arles	246 x 166 (208 x 128)	Some outer	Unknown. German? palaeographical features, 13 th -c. ownership inscription f. 62 ^v	Ten Duinen
	63 ^r –84 ^v	c. 1151–c. 1175	<i>De spiritu et littera</i> , <i>Epistulae</i> , <i>Enchiridion de fide, spe et caritate</i> , Augustine	246 x 166 (208 x 120)	Outer	Unknown. Italian features	Ten Duinen

297	1 ^r -55 ^v	c. 1176-c. 1200	<i>Epistula (ad Bernardus), De reparatione humani generis (parabolarium), Galand of Regny</i>	190 x 130 (143 x 89)	Outer	Ten Duinen	Ten Duinen
	56 ^r -167 ^v	c. 1176-c. 1200	<i>De reparatione humani generis (parabolarium), Epistula (ad Bernardus), Galand of Regny</i>	190 x 130 (143 x 89)	Outer	Ten Duinen	Ten Duinen
302	1 ^v -113 ^r	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>De contemptu seculi, Epistolae et sermones, Peter Damian; Sententia Lanfranci episcopi ad Symonem monachum, Lanfranc of Bec; De libro qui appellatur gratissimus Petri Damiani quedam capitula, Peter Damian</i>	303 x 210 (255 x 160)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, 13 th -c. ownership inscription verso back flyleaf	Ten Duinen
378	1 ^r -83 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>Decretalium collectio Brugensis, Pope Innocent IV</i>	235 x 170 (185 x 124)	Outer	Reims. Scribe identified as Garnerus of St-Remi in Falkenstein, 'Zu Entstehungsort und Redaktor der Collectio Brugensis'	None
379	1 ^r -83 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>Decretalium collectio Brugensis, Pope Innocent IV</i>	284 x 193 (200 x 128)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, is a copy of MS 378	Ten Duinen
	83 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>Decretalium collectio Brugensis, Pope Innocent IV</i>	284 x 193 (196 x 128)	Outer	Ten Duinen. Codicological features, shares folio with ff. 1 ^r -83 ^v	Ten Duinen
507	1 ^r -85 ^r	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>Liber Policraticus in dogmate philosophorum moralium, John of Salisbury; Sermones varii, Anon.</i>	215 x 150 (165 x 84)	Outer	Unknown	None
	85 ^r	c. 1201-c. 1225	Various sentences	215 x 150 (175 x 108)	Outer	Unknown	None
	85 ^v -87 ^r	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>De sex alis Cherubim, Hugh of St-Victor</i>	215 x 150 (175 x 108)	Outer	Unknown	None
	87 ^r -88 ^v	c. 1201-c. 1225	<i>De sex alis Cherubim, Hugh of St-Victor</i>	215 x 150 (195 x 135)	Outer	Unknown	None

	1 ^r –4 ^r	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>Horologium, Designatio monocordi,</i> Martianus Capella	197 x 145 (156 x 94)	Outer	Unknown	None
532	4 ^v –21 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>De trinitate, De hebdomadibus, De fide</i> <i>christiana, De duabus naturis,</i> <i>Consolatione philosophiae,</i> Boethius	197 x 145 (156 x 129)	Outer	Unknown	None
	22 ^r –80 ^v	c. 1201–c. 1225	<i>De senectute, De paradoxa stoicorum,</i> <i>De amicitia,</i> Cicero; Fragment, Martianus Capella	197 x 145 (156 x 94)	Outer	Unknown	None
533	1 ^r –134 ^r	c. 1126–c. 1150	<i>Grammatica,</i> Priscian	235 x 158 (174 x 100)	Some outer	Unknown	None

APPENDIX B

SIMULTANEOUS COPYING

There is a third possible production relationship — simultaneous copying — that is not identifiable among the manuscript units of my corpus. Simultaneous copying occurs when units were produced at the same time and place, with the intention that they would be bound together after completion. Units linked by simultaneous copying demonstrate active collaboration: the work to be done was divided up amongst two or more scribes, perhaps under the guidance of a scriptorium master or stationer, with the aim that they jointly contribute to a manuscript's completion. It is possible for manuscript units to have been produced simultaneously without leaving traces of this process of dividing labour, making them indistinguishable from contemporary sequential units. Simultaneous copying, however, probably occurred less frequently than other copying scenarios for several reasons.

Simultaneous copying makes certain demands of the exemplar that other scenarios do not. For multiple scribes to work on the same text at the same time, either the exemplar must be broken from its binding in order to physically separate the quires, the exemplar must be already unbound to be shared amongst scribes as quires or booklets, or several copies of the exemplar text must be available. Because of the many potential choices made by the scribe, manuscripts containing the same text may have different numbers of words or lines per page and different numbers of folios. If multiple exemplars were used, they would have to have identical *mise en page* to ensure that no text was missed or duplicated at points of division amongst scribes, and to avoid gaps on the page or inconsistent quire sizes where one scribe's work ended and another's began.

Simultaneous copying moreover requires that each scribe work strictly within the writing unit allotted to him or her. If the copied text used more or less space than the exemplar, there would be gaps in the textblock or blank folios, unless the inconsistency measured precisely a full recto and verso of one or more folios; if a manuscript does feature gaps in the textblock or blank folios at points where there is a change of scribe, its units were probably produced simultaneously. As the basic unit of writing, division by quire would be most efficient. Therefore, manuscripts copied using this method probably show scribal changes where one quire ends and the next begins.

Because of these demands on exemplars and scribes, simultaneous copying was probably unsuitable for many scriptoria. However, this would be an ideal arrangement in cases where copies needed to be made quickly or in multiple, with scribes each completing their part of the final product much in the way of workers in today's factory assembly lines. Although not witnessed in my corpus, such a division of labour may have taken place among commercial book producers affiliated with universities, where exemplars divided into *pecia* were available and multiple copies demanded by a larger

clientele. Simultaneous copying may have been favourable in some monastic contexts, such as Tours's scriptorium at the turn of the ninth century. Alcuin's newly revised Bible text could have provided a suitable unbound exemplar, and multiple copies were needed with some degree of urgency to send to other monasteries following reforms in the Frankish Church. I am unaware of any studies of these particular contexts with specific interest or attention to the division of scribal labour, although both have been studied extensively in regard to book production and surviving manuscripts more generally.

APPENDIX C

EARLY FOLIATION

Literature occasionally cites twelfth-century examples of foliation that are rarely identified, but credited with being among the first. Ten Duinen's foliation is one such case, as was explored in Chapter 4.7. The abbey is not necessarily alone in its innovative creation, or early adoption, of foliation. Two other early users of foliation were Beaupré and Signy, both Cistercian abbeys.

Saenger refers to (but does not specify with shelfmarks) twenty-two foliated manuscripts from Beaupré with foliation, remarking that the abbey's scriptorium was 'one of the first in the Latin West to add foliation systematically to its books'.¹ However, of Beaupré's twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts digitized by the Bibliothèque nationale de France, none feature foliation that can be called 'systematic' due to its wide variety of application, although some may be contemporary with Ten Duinen's foliation. **Paris, BnF, lat. 286** and **1729** (c. 1176–c. 1200, probably towards the beginning of this period) feature foliation that is neither added by the main scribe nor the main glossator (but is probably by the same hand in both manuscripts). It is undatable without external evidence, but there is no reason to assume it is pre-1300.

In **lat. 482**, folio numbers are added in the margins of the chapter table on ff. 5^r–6^v and throughout the manuscript by a late thirteenth-century hand. This foliation may be roughly contemporary with Ten Duinen's foliation. A different late thirteenth-century hand adds an informal table to the back of **lat. 17462**, but the foliation seems to have been trimmed away. From the mid-thirteenth century, **lat. 2514** has inconsistently applied foliation; the letters it uses are certainly post-1250, and probably post-1300. However, **lat. 3279**, datable to c. 1201–c. 1225 (probably nearer the latter year), has Roman numeral foliation; based on style, it is not by the same hand as the foliation in any of the other manuscripts mentioned here, and could be early.

Of Beaupré's remaining digitized manuscripts at the Bibliothèque nationale, **lat. 356, 647, 2823, 2935, and 3177** show no visible foliation in their digital images. There are additional contemporary, but presently undigitized, manuscripts from Beaupré: **lat. 117, 391, 625, 1777, 1976, 2028, 2047, 2080, 2309, 2343 (1-2), 2552, 2733, 2912, 3800A, and 4281A**. Given the above survey of the eleven already-digitized manuscripts, it is possible that several more of the undigitized manuscripts contain foliation. Still, I suspect foliation was not particularly systematic at Beaupré, but instead applied piece-meal and at different times by different readers. Although inconsistent, it was probably introduced around the same time as it developed at Ten Duinen.

As for Signy, Saenger cites two manuscripts: **Charleville-Mezieres, Bibliothèque municipale, MSS 49** and **114**. **MS 49** is indeed twelfth-century and features foliation, although it is unclear when it was added: the available images are microfiche, and it is

¹ Saenger, 'Reading in the Later Middle Ages', pp. 123–24.

impossible to tell from them if the ink is that of the main scribe or of the rubricator. **MS 114**, on the other hand, is attributed to before 1148 (apparently produced before the death of William of St-Thierry) but given the degree of letter biting and angularity, is more correctly dated to the early thirteenth century. Unfortunately, no foliation is visible on the only two folios available online at the time of writing (ff. 1^v and 3^r).

APPENDIX D

EARLY REBINDING

The bindings of eleven manuscripts in my corpus — **MSS 10, 19, 27, 83, 93, 102, 105, 120, 130, 152, and 166** — are classified as early Cistercian bindings from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by the Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek in the online catalogue (as of the time of writing) and an online article.¹ The bindings of this group, barring that of **MS 19** which is recognized by the OB as a rebinding, are also identified as original. While mostly agreeing with their published assessments of this group of bookbindings, I must respectfully disagree that these are first bindings for most of the manuscript contents of **MS 10, 102, 130, and 152**. Each of these manuscripts show evidence of having been in a hard or limp binding prior to the one in which it survives. The reasons for my disagreement with currently catalogued assessments of these as original bindings follow.

There are instances in **MS 10** where marginal text is trimmed through, most certainly during rebinding. For example, the running title on f. 103^v is bisected. Further, the proportions of the margin to textblock suggest significant trimming consistent with rebinding: the margins account for 33 per cent of the page area, whereas the average marginal space of units in my study's corpus (including both manuscripts in original and later bindings) accounts for 41 per cent (see Chapter 1.14).² While the book block of **MS 10** is datable to c. 1176–c. 1200, the flyleaves and pastedowns, due to considerable letter biting and bow-breaking, are decidedly post-1250. They are foliated along with the rest of the manuscript, meaning that the binding containing them pre-dates foliation which took place in the second half of the thirteenth century, but post-dates the script of the flyleaves and pastedowns.³ The binding of **MS 10** is therefore not the manuscript's original, and dates between c. 1251 and c. 1300.

The evidence of **MS 102**'s later binding is more complicated. The manuscript's foliation begins at b on the verso of the opening flyleaf, which is a singleton. The folio labelled a is missing; it too was a singleton, as no scrap of it remains and no text is lost (if it were a bifolium, it would either leave behind at least scraps of its other half, or the other half would also be missing, resulting in text loss at the end of the quire). The final folio in the first quire, f. 8, is labelled **k**; it is also now a singleton, and at the time of foliation it was the tenth folio in the sequence. Because all versos are foliated and show no sign of significant trimming on the top edge after they were added, this binding

¹ Online catalogue entries for Bruges Openbare Bibliotheek's Historisch Fonds can be accessed by entering their manuscript number (for example, 'MS 13', without additional shelfmark information) at <https://www.brugge.be/bibliotheek>. The catalogue does undergo periodic updates. The article referenced is Blog Openbare Bibliotheek Brugge, 'Expertenoverleg over vroege cisterciënzerboekbanden'.

² While not a certain sign of rebinding on its own, these disproportionately small margins support evidence of trimming, and thus that the binding is not original to the c. 1176–c. 1200 contents.

³ It was probably added in the third quarter of the thirteenth century; see Chapter 4.7.

seems to slightly predate the foliation (c. 1251–c. 1300).⁴ This manuscript has a rather convoluted first quire, which is rare; it is probable that at the time of production (c. 1151–c. 1175) the first quire was simply four bifolia, with the opening folio (a jagged scrap of which remains between the first flyleaf and f. 1, once attached to what is now f. 8) serving as the blank flyleaf protecting the text's incipit. At some point this flyleaf became damaged or was removed, and in the subsequent binding (the current one) two singletons were added at the opening (**a** and **b**), of which one survives.

While the convoluted first quire is inconclusive alone, other evidence that the binding of **MS 102** is not as old as the book block presents itself: marginal notation, contemporary to the main hand, has been bisected by trimming (in addition to notes for the rubricator which one might expect to be trimmed away). It was likely added by an early reader and trimmed when this binding was made. Perhaps, as might be interpreted from its first-quire damage but limited edge trimming, this book block spent its first approximate century and a half in a limp binding or even tacketed in a wrapper, somewhat protected but awaiting the sturdy binding it still wears today.⁵

As argued in greater detail in Chapter 5.4, **MS 130**'s binding is almost certainly fourteenth century and is impossibly the book block's first binding. Its black Roman numeral foliation, predating the characteristic Ten Duinen foliation, has been conspicuously trimmed, and its red Ten Duinen foliation is placed much closer to the top edge than it usually appears, indicating that it was bound after foliation was added, thus post-c. 1250. With the exception of an unfoliated chapter table dating near the mid-thirteenth century (providing the earliest possible date for the current binding), its contents are from the third quarter of the twelfth century, and likely had an earlier temporary — perhaps limp — binding. Most telling, however, is that the current binding displays several clear indicators of being a fourteenth-century Gothic binding according to Szirmai's standards.

Lastly, **MS 152** also shows evidence of its present binding not being contemporary with its book block. Some notes are bisected by trimming: on f. 21^r, for example, the note should read 'Quomodo ramus oliva reportetur ad archam', but the terminal **a** is missing from 'oliva' at the edge of the page, with no contraction mark offered. Furthermore, the quire signatures on ff. 48^v, 78^v, and 139^v are bisected by trimming, which might have been a result of their placement prior to initial binding, but may also indicate the significant trimming that occurs more readily in rebinding. These quire signatures are also in two different pens — one red (f. 78^v), one black (ff. 48^v and 139^v) — with the red pen applying a different layout of decorative dots around the numerals than the black: these two sets of quire signatures may represent two distinct rounds of

⁴ As mentioned above, the Openbare Bibliotheek catalogue correctly lists **MS 102**'s binding as twelfth- to thirteenth-century. Vandamme and Geirnaert, 'Cisterciënzerbibliotheken', p. 63 n. 22, erroneously note it as a fourteenth-century binding. The manuscript mentioned alongside it (**MS 476**) is fourteenth-century, but besides its chain clamp, all other elements of **MS 102**'s binding place it before c. 1300.

⁵ On tackets, both used during copying to hold bifolia in quires, and in limp bindings, see, e.g., Gullick, 'From Scribe to Binder'; Szirmai, *Medieval Bookbindings*, pp. 285–319.

binding. The red signature is nearly wholly removed, and therefore may be the earlier of the two styles. However, because quire signatures are virtually undateable, it is unclear whether these were both added at the time of the main text (although by different pens) or at a time of later rebinding(s). Like **MS 102**, **MS 152** lacks its first folio labelled **a**, although it may have been adapted from a flyleaf into the present pastedown and lost its corner.