at St. Columba itself (27). One might wonder if Becket's manuscript of Gallus is not to be identified with the subject of Mr. G. B. T. Martin's MS 101, 13638. The coincidence of hard and soft evidence is striking. It is certain (1) that the older part of MS 13843 (8) could easily date from the years of Becket's exile, 1164-1176; and (2) that π and Γ are gallois. It is probable (1) that Becket's and Henry's manuscripts are to be identified with π. Thus, it is possible that Becket's manuscript could be identified with Γ. How the volume might have left Canterbury and found its way to the abbey is unknown.

Pietro's two manuscripts needed extensive work before they would be a usable book. Each portion was itself incomplete. To the fifteenth-century manuscript of Books 1-7 he supplied the missing table of chapters for Book 18 c. 15 to the end of Book 19, on a leaf added for the purpose, and he completed the end of Book 16 c. 19 to the end of Book 20. He added an added leaf. As is the case for the legenda to Book 8, the end of Book 20 from c. 107 Massa Bootse was not made before the fifteenth century. For both halves of the text Pietro supplied the missing portions from a similar but slightly different exemplar. Pietro added and corrected the Greek texts. He had to supply from another source virtually all the Greek since they were corrupt and wrote them afresh (See Pl. 16). Where space did not permit, he wrote the Greek text on slips of parchment and bound them in the codex. His source for the Greek text should be readily identifiable among the surviving manuscripts of the Attic Nights; the editors should care to look. Throughout the whole volume, he entered running headlines giving the title and the book, and added marginal index notes, drawing attention to ancient writers and rare vocabulary (See Pl. 15, 16). Finally, to make the disparate sections of his book appear more uniform it seems that he had humanistic initials, in the same style, added to both the fifteenth and the earlier parts (See Pl. 15, 16).

Pietro wrote a neat and even round hand. Given his efforts to produce a uniform volume, it is curious that he composed a humanistic manuscript in semi-graphic script. His Greek hand is equally pleasing artistically. He apparently made use of the manuscript. Besides the marginal index notes, he has added exegetical quotations from Priscian, Martianus Capella, Ciceron in Pisces, Prophets-Catholic, and Plato's Parmenides (in Greek).

The history of Pietro's Gallus after his death is not known. It presumably passed with his books to the house of San Giovanni. It had left the house already in the sixteenth century, long before the library was cataloged by Tomsonis in 1639, and it appeared among the books of Claude Dupay (d. 1594) whose signature is on I. 1. From Dupay's volume passed to Pierre Séguier (1588-1672), chancellor of France, and with his books it went to his grandson Henri Charles de Camboun de Cossin (1630-1732), who bequeathed the library to the abbey of St. Germain des Prés; there it remained until the abbey's books passed to the national library in 1791. It is quite possible that our manuscript was used by Caspar Schoppe (1576-1649) and is known in the Grenovius edition of 1706, and quoted by Hertz in his edition of Gallus (29). Schoppe cites a "[†††]_[†††]_" for a number of readings which reappear in Γ for example: Book 12 c. 211 leuev, c. 52, abhi for the correct abhi, c. 13. 26, qua, c. 13. 29, qua. If this is the case, Schoppe must have used the manuscript when it belonged to Chancellor Séguier.

A C. DE LA MARCHE,
P. K. MARSHALL,
R. H. ROUSE

A NINTH CENTURY SCHOOLBOOK FROM THE LORE VALLEY: PHILIPPS MS. 1638

A direct evidence of the ninth century is the actual possession of a student manuscript of Latin grammar. The manuscript was acquired by Sir Thomas Phillips at the Guelphum Libri...
sale in London on 28th March, 1859 (5). Unfortunately it is not known from which French monastic library Libri may have purchased the book. He may even have cut Part II from a complete text of the Ars Minor in the same manus- crip which he mutilated Orléans MS 297 (250), by cutting the three books of the Ars Minor from the rest of the col- lection of grammatical treatises (6). It was quite common for the Ars Minor to be copied in the order I, I. III, in the ninth century (7), so it would have been a simple matter to extract the first part of the manuscript, Part II, and sell it separately. The binding is described as "eighth century calf with a red morocco label" (8), and the width of the spine being greater than that of the contents, with room for more gatherings, suggests that the manuscript once con- tained more leaves than it does at present.

It has unfortunately been possible to make but a brief examination of the manuscript so far, and only If 1'-P can be studied in any detail (10). Some preliminary suggestions about the importance and interest of Phillips 16308 may nevertheless be helpful. Phillips 16308 is avell manuscript, containing twenty-four leaves, measuring 252 mm x 192 mm, and in three gatherings of originally ten, twelve and six leaves, although there appear now to be four leaves wanting after I. 6, for only the stubs remain. The folios are not numbered, and for the purposes of this note the folios have been cited as if numbered consecutively through the manuscript. It is generally without quire marks or signatures apart from a slightly written "L. H. factor in the right-hand margin of If 24. The text is written with seventeen long lines to a page, for which at least two hands are responsible. Scribe "A" for If 1'-3" and Scribe "B" for If 4'-24". The script is in a well formed, rounded and vertical Caroline minuscule. Some characteristics of the script include a double opened a, a miniscule e, a graceful long curve on the bottom left hand stroke of the x, a short t, hardly clubbed ascenders and the occasional use of uncial capitals at the beginnings of sen- tences in the text. It can be identified as the script of the region of Tours in the second quarter of the ninth century.

There are very few abbreviations or ligatures, apart from the "standard" Tours f t; a t for ets; g for -que and p for per. Usually a medially denotes both a comma and a full stop, used with remarkable regularity, with an occasional use of a semi-colon for a full stop. Each section of the text is headed with a title in rustic capitals, and the first letter of each section is a large initial with red. The first P on If 1' is also filled in with red and some zig-zag ornamentation in the vertical stem. Some line uncial capitals form the explicit on the right hand side of the vellum. Some prickings are visible at the outer edge of the margin, and the rolling itself, done with a hard point, appears to be that according to the method described by E. K. Hand as "Tours Ofl-Style" (11). That is, when the leaves were ruled, two or four at a time, they were arranged with the ins side opposite last side, and fresh side opposite fresh side, so that when bound in quires, (in this case probably with leaves drawn at random from the pile) on the edges of the manuscript, the quires confluence groove. This method suggests a date for the manuscript, which the script certainly permits, of about the end of the first quarter of the ninth century.

Most of the work was observed in the production of the manuscript. Rather inferior quality vellum was used, and old leaves were re-used, for there is an erased text on If 5' on the depression of pronomos which is not by Donatus, and which is partly visible under ultra-violet light (12). In the ending of the pages themselves, there are what would appear to be extraordinarily wide margins. Some of these margins however, I. 2' for example, have been carefully ruled with narrower lines than the text, and it can only be concluded that the scribe of the text was not designed the work to accommodate annotations and glosses to the text. The manuscript in fact contains a great number of such annota- tions and glosses in varying degrees of sophistication and legibility, for which at least two hands are responsible. There is also a very faint and poorly written commentary on If 5' and 21', which has been partly cut off by the binding. The extravagance in the preparation of the text was thus an intentional one with a utilitarian purpose, for the book was intended to serve as text, exercise and note book.

The whole arrangement of the main text contrasts apparently with the general practice for the production of texts of the Ars Minor of Donatus, for one editor of that text has observed that most of its manuscripts run on line after line, with few marks of sentence beginnings or endings (5). Phillips 16308 on the other hand takes considerable pains to make the text clear and well ordered for a learner's eye, with sentences clearly punctuated and each section headed in rustic capitals.

The grammar of Donatus was evidently widely used in the ninth century. Alcuin refers to the worth of his works in his famous York poem (13) and Lapis of Freyberg cites him with respect in his letter to Einhard (14). It was also listed among the possessions of a number of Carolingian monasteries. Reichenau in 822 for example possessed four copies, as well as a book of excerpts from Donatus and Priscian; the St. Hipter monastery lists one manuscript; the 15th century list from Freising includes Donatus major et minor among its posses-
sions; and the ninth century St. Gall catalogue lists five copies of Dona-
The scribe of f. 1r-3r, who was also the corrector of the whole text, took pains, not only to correct the text from another exemplar, but also to insert interlinear and marginal glosses to make the meaning, and particularly the syntax, absolutely clear for the benefit of the reader. For example, on f. 1r (Keil p. 373.127) where Donatus wrote *Graecae magis servabimus, the corrector added *quoniam Latitavam, and further on on the same page, where the discussion proceeds about proper names, referring to them as *hominem, the corrector inserted *nonnumquam to ensure the reader would know exactly what subject it was to which the pronoun related. Again, an explanatory note, *patre, is added to the phrase *Aditores ab Alteo, while in the first paragraph where the text reads *ex his omnibus (f. 1r and Keil p. 372.126) referring to the eight parts of speech, the corrector expands *his by adding *aetna participis.

Apart from this clarifying type of gloss, the corrector also made a number of emendations in the form of additions to the text. The Donatus text presented in philipps 16308 is a good one, showing a number of independent variants from that printed in Keil (21). The corrector himself must also have had a better exemplar of the text than Donatus had when correcting and annotating the philipps text. He probably corrected the copy once it had been completed and before it left the monastery where it was written (perhaps at the request of Sado's mother) or at least before it was given to Sado.

There are a great many textual variants between the philipps manuscript and the version printed in Keil, and some idea of the manuscript tradition to which philipps 16308 is related may be gained by a comparison, in parallel columns, of readings between the two texts and any additions made by the corrector.
Some of the textual variants are no more remarkable than differences in spelling, but these differences show that those manuscripts used by Keil for his edition most closely resemble Phillips 16308. With the summary examination of the manuscript that was possible it is difficult to propose any relationship with any degree of certainty, but it does seem that Phillips 16308 has the most affinities with the manuscripts labelled L, S, and P in Keil's edition, in spelling, readings and glosses (22). In particular, some odd marginal annotations in the Phillips text, for example, section (6) above, appear as part of the text of Keil's manuscript S in a now deleted line. Again, Keil p. 373, 122 reads ut illa huncus. The Phillips text reads ut illa solus huncus, with a note, toll, added by an interrogator above the line. This would appear to be a combination of the P reading, terra huncus solus, and the S reading, terra huncus solus. It would appear that this Phillips copy of the text was made from the P or P text or one of its type, and corrected by copying it with an S text.

Whatever manuscripts were used as exemplars, what the corrections and variants do establish beyond a doubt is the scholarship and intelligence of the corrector. He was not beyond emending the text with some independence of spirit, and was moreover a good teacher, taking the trouble to render the text less ambiguous for a less competent reader. So too, the marginal and interlinear glosses have the immediate function of making this particular grammatical text more intelligible for a student.

It remains to be considered who may have been responsible for this text and its glosses, and where it might have been used, and some conjectures can be made.

The script itself suggested the line of enquiry, for there is some similarity between the script of f. 1-4, 3-4 and the corrections and some glosses of Phillips 16308, and the marginal notes in Paris B.N. Int. 7774 (23), which have been attributed to Lupus of Ferrières (24). Other autograph manuscripts of Lupus, such as Harley 2174 in the British Library (Cicerio de Ordine) or the Orleans manuscript, Orleans Bibl. M.m. 163 (139) (25) also reveal similar traits, such as the consistent use of the abbreviation for 'for', the little hook on the p abbreviation for per the double open-ended g and the long curv on the x. Except however for one or two instances, on f. 1r for example, the characteristic g ligature of Lupus is not frequent. It is certain that Lupus had read the works of Donatus and had a high opinion of his grammar, as has already been noted, and it could well be that, given Lupus' acknowledged skill and interest in textual criticism and the production of fair copies of classical texts and his undoubted enthusiasm for passing on his learning (26), that this Phillips manuscript can be counted as an addition to the Lupus 'corpus'. At the very least, if not by Lupus himself, then the similarities in script, approach to the text, and above all the method displayed make it probable that this mid-nineteenth century copy of Donatus was written by a disciple of Lupus and used in a monastic school, either that of Ferrières itself, or at a neighbouring monastery in the Loire region which had connections with Ferrières.

A number of possibilities for the origin of the manuscript present themselves. It has been pointed out by Elisabeth Pellegrin in her enquiry concerning the origin of the manuscripts of Lupus of Ferrières, that there exists no proof of the existence of a scriptorium or even a library at Ferrières (27). E. Lessivell certainly remains suitable vague on the subject (28). Miss Pellegrin went on however, to stress the position of Ferrières in the Loire region, "de confluente entre ces deux important centres d'Auxerre et de Clefry qui devait être celle de Ferrières au 72 siècle". Either Auxerre or Clefry could well be the origin of the Phillips manuscript. Not only is there some justification for positing the existence of a flourishing 'elementary school' at these centres in the ninth century (29), at which the Ars Major of Donatus must have been a standard text, and at which disciples of Lupus of Ferrières such as Heire of Auxerre are known to have taught, but it should also be recalled that the two important and evidently popular commentaries on Donatus by Marindac the Scot and Remigius of Auxerre, were written at Auxerre in the middle of the ninth century.

It is therefore suggested that Phillips 16308 could have been one of those manuscripts pitted by Libri in the 1680 s. Furthermore, this manuscript was written by a scribe at one of the principal monasteries in the Loire region, Ferrières, Pleyr, Auxerre, or one of those closely associated with it, and this scribe was possibly a student of Donatus. Besides containing in its margins what may well prove to be an important grammatical commentary, the text itself was well used in a monastic school, and provides unique insight into the process of instruction in the basic principles of Latin grammar in the ninth century, a process of instruction which was the necessary foundation of the "Cerou-lingia Renaissance" (30).

Rosamond M. Kitterick