

a074976

MEDIAEVAL
STUDIES

Volume XXX
1968



PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
TORONTO, CANADA

Lupus of Ferrières: Carolingian Scribe and Text Critic

ROBERT J. GARIÉPY, JR.

LUPUS Servatus, Abbot of Ferrières, has long been celebrated as occupying a prominent place in medieval intellectual history, and he is usually considered one of the most cultured men of the ninth century. He has been called the first humanist — a man who, when compared with other men of the Carolingian Age, attained a solitary pre-eminence in the field of humanistic studies. Since he professed to have a wide range of literary interests, he has been considered a precursor of the humanists of the later Renaissance. Moreover, it has been said that he displays a wide knowledge of Latin literature by his frequent references to Latin authors.¹ There is another aspect of his scholarly pursuits, however, which stamps him as the pre-eminent humanist of the Carolingian Age — his accomplishments as a scribe and text critic. It will be the purpose of this study to consider this side of Lupus' literary attainments.

Believing as he did in seeking knowledge for its own sake, Lupus made it one of his greatest aims in life not only to acquire manuscripts, but also to correct and copy them. This presented something of a problem because at that time it was often difficult to locate books, and, when this was accomplished, the loan of the precious and costly manuscripts had to be arranged. Copies of them must then be made and the original sent back to the owner. However, Lupus was indefatigable in increasing his library's resources. Anyone who had a book which was not in the Ferrières library was subject to petition. Thus, he borrowed from the monasteries of Tours, Fulda, and Prüm among others, and from his friends Einhard, Wenilo, Reginbert, and Marward, and even went so far as to ask Altsigis of York and Pope Benedict III for manuscripts.

Although Lupus was eager to borrow books, he was very reluctant to lend them. Time and again he pleaded that the troubled times prevented safe transportation of his precious books. To Reginbert he wrote, "in

regno Karolo... impune latrocinia committuntur et nihil securius atque constantius quam rapinarum violentia frequentatur." (*Epist.*, 101).² It is interesting to add that Lupus, in the final paragraph of the same letter, and in spite of the dangers just enumerated, still requested his friend to send *him* some books. In another letter to Alwin of Sens he said that, since he feared to lend a manuscript which was in constant demand, he had almost resolved to send it to some place of security for fear of losing it himself. In addition to this, Lupus added, even though the distance from Ferrières to Sens was short, yet the messenger would be traveling on foot and thus more subject to peril:

Librum quem petisti multi quibus non erat commodandus meum post reditum flagitarunt. Quare ablegandum illum aliquo, ne perire contingeret, pene statui. Hunc a me, cum veneris, forsitan impetrabis. Nam huic clerico etsi, quia tibi fidus est, hunc committi posse videbam, tamen non satis tuto, quod pedes erat, te non advertisse miratus sum. (*Epist.* 8).

In still another letter Lupus tells Reginbert that he would have sent the book which Reginbert had requested if he had had a suitable courier to take it to him: "Librum quem flagitasti misissem, nisi lator defuisset idoneus." (*Epist.*, 11).

The rich bindings of some books of those days rendered them especially tempting prizes to the highwayman. Thus, in a letter to Hincmar of Rheims Lupus said that he was afraid to send the *Collectaneum* of Bede because, since it was too large to fit conveniently into a wallet, it was liable to be stolen. But Lupus himself would bring it to Hincmar at some later date:

Collectaneum Bedae in apostolum ex operibus Augustini veritas sum dirigere, propterea quod tantus est liber, ut nec sinu celari nec pera possit satis commode contineri. Quanquam, si alterutrum fieret, formidanda esset obvia improborum rapacitas, quam profecto pulchritudo ipsius codicis accendisset, et ita forsitan et mihi et vobis perisset. Proinde tuto vobis memoratum volumen ipse commo-daturus sum, cum primo, si Deus vult, aliquo nos contigerit sospites convenire. (*Epist.* 108).

Lupus has sent ten pine cones, however, since these could be easily carried!

It was in the copying of manuscripts that Lupus was outstanding. His thirst for knowledge, however, was not quenched with the possession of a manuscript, especially if it were incomplete. This is evident from a letter to Pope Benedict III where Lupus says: "Petimus etiam Tullium *De oratore*

¹ For the most recent publication on this aspect of Lupus' scholarship, see Wolfgang Edelstein, *Euditio und Sapientia: Weltbild und Erziehung in der Karolingerzeit. Untersuchungen zu Alcuins Briefen*. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1965), 169-219.

² The best edition of Lupus' letters is that of L. Levillain, *Lupus de Ferrières, Correspondance (Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France, 10 and 16, 1927-35)*, which was reprinted in 1964 by l'Association Guillaume Budé "Les Belles Lettres." All references are to this edition.

et duodecim libros *Institutionum oratoriarum* Quintilianī, qui uno nec ingenti volumine continentur; quorum utriusque auctorum partes habemus, verum plenitudinem per vos desideramus obtinere." (*Epist.*, 100). When he tried to get a copy made at Ferrières of some book that his library lacked he was doing nothing different from what other scholarly abbots and librarians of his time were doing. But what makes Lupus unique is that he was never satisfied with the copy of a work he had, but was always eager to get another copy so that he could collate the two and arrive at a better text. This idea is brought out in a letter to Ansbaldus: "Tullianas epistolas, quas misisti, cum nostris conferri faciam, ut ex utrisque, si possit fieri, veritas exculpatur." (*Epist.* 69). It was this trait of Lupus that caused C. H. Beeson to remark: "The urge for a second copy from which to correct the first is almost as strong in Lupus as the desire for a new text. It is this characteristic that distinguishes him from all the other scholars of the Middle Ages."³ Similarly, E. Norden considered this trait as making Lupus a humanist: "Wer fühlt sich bei dem allen nicht erinnert an die Briefe der Humanisten mit ihrem sechsüchtigen Verlangen nach neuen und vollständigen Autoren? Ja, in einem Punkte ist er sogar den meisten Humanisten voraus: er will nicht bloss Texte, sondern gute Texte."⁴

Most modern scholarship has treated Lupus from the standpoint of his textual work. Such eminent palaeographers as E. A. Lowe, C. H. Beeson, E. K. Rand, L. Traube, P. Lehmann, and W. M. Lindsay have studied the manuscripts which were known to Lupus and corrected by him. A 1936 dissertation, *The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières* by Sister L. Meagher, dealt exclusively with his manuscript of Aulus Gellius, and Beeson's work on Lupus' autograph copy of Cicero's *De oratore* is a masterpiece of scholarship.

Before we discuss some of the modern work that has been done on certain manuscripts that Lupus is known to have criticized, it seems advisable to list the manuscripts that have been attributed to him, whether correctly or incorrectly.

GENUINE LUPUS MANUSCRIPTS

There has been some dispute about the true identity of the corrector of a few of the manuscripts attributed to Lupus. It is generally agreed,

³ *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic: A Study of His Autograph Copy of Cicero's De Oratore* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), 4.

⁴ *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert vor Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1909), 2, 701.

however, that Lupus is the scribe or corrector of the following manuscripts:⁵

- Berne 366
- Valerius Maximus, *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*
- London, Brit. Mus. Harleianus 2736
- Cicero, *De oratore*
- Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5726
- Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, Books VI-X
- Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 6370
- Macrobius, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* and beginning of the *Saturnalia*, Book I
- Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7774 A
- Cicero, *Orationes in Verrem* (Act. II, or. IV-V) *De inventione*
- Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 8623
- Symmachus, *Epistolae*, Books I-VIII
- Vatican, Reg. lat. 597
- Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, Books IX-XX
- Vatican, Reg. lat. 1484
- Tiberius Claudius Donatus, *Interpretationes Vergilianae Aeneidos*, Books I-VI
- Vatican, Cod. lat. 474
- Augustine, *Sermones*
- Vienna, Bibl. Nat. Cod. 189
- Cicero, philosophical corpus, i.e. *De natura deorum*, *De divinatione*, *De fato*, *Timaeus*, *Topica*, *Paradoxa*, *Lucullus* (*Academica Priora*), *De legibus*
- Berlin, Bibl. Nat. lat. 126 (Phillips 1872)
- Ierome, *Chronica Eusebii*

POSSIBLE LUPUS MANUSCRIPTS

The following manuscripts were included in the list of Lowe and some of them have been commented on by Traube. There is not universal agreement, however, that all of them were actually worked on by Lupus. Some of them are judged to be "en rapport" with Lupus' critical method but may have in fact been corrected by one of Lupus' students, such as Heiric of Auxerre.⁶

⁵ See especially C. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*; E. A. Lowe, "Nugae Palaeographicae," *Persecution and Liberty: Essays in Honor of George Lincoln Burr* (New York, 1931), 62-64; E. Pellegrin, "Les Manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières," *BECh*, 115 (1957), 5-31; E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours* (*Studies in the Script of Tours*, 1, Cambridge, Mass., 1929); E. K. Rand and I. W. Jones, *The Earliest Book of Tours with Supplementary Descriptions of Other Manuscripts of Tours* (*Studies in the Script of Tours*, 2, Cambridge, Mass., 1934), and L. Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, 3, ed. S. Brandt (Munich, 1920).

⁶ The Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7496, for example, which contains some various works of Priscian and which is considered a Lupus MS by Lowe is instead attributed to Heiric by M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1911-13), 1, 489.

- Leyden, Voss. lat. f. 12b
 Cicero, *De senectute*
 Macrobius, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*
 Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5763⁷
 Caesar, *De bello gallico*
 Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 6332
 Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes*
De senectute
 Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7496
 Priscian, various works
 Paris, Bibl. Nat. N.A. 1626
 Lucan, *De bello civile*

There are three other manuscripts which F. Carey considers to have been annotated by Lupus.⁸

- Berne 391
 Cicero, *De officiis*
 Berne 451
 Quintus Curtius, *Historia Alexandri Magni*
 Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 1913 A
 Augustine, *Confessiones*

Finally, there is a manuscript which the latest commentator on Lupus' manuscripts, E. Pellegrin, claims to have been "corrigé de sa main."⁹ This is the Orléans 162 (139) which contains three works of Augustine: *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, *Epistula CCVII ad Claudium*, and *Contra Iulianum*.

The total, then, of manuscripts which have been attributed with more or less certainty to Lupus is twenty. Of this number it seems safe to conclude that at least those contained on our first list were actually written or corrected by him. Beeson, the greatest specialist in Lupus' textual work, certified only six of the total, but he died before the work of Carey and Pellegrin appeared. Other experts on Lupus' style and method of textual criticism are also deceased, so there remains no one of their caliber to pass judgment on the validity of Carey's or Pellegrin's claims. But there are enough manuscripts available that can be certainly attributed to Lupus to be able to ascertain his style and method of textual correction.

⁷ Lowe lists this MS as "doubtful"; Pellegrin, p. 15, says, "Les notes marginales, d'une écriture angloise, ne sont pas de la main de Loup."

⁸ "MSS from the Scriptorium of Saint-Germain d'Auxerre" (1956), 2-3. These MSS are listed by Pellegrin, 17-19; of the MSS listed by Carey, she agrees only with the possible attribution to Lupus of Berne 391.

⁹ "Les Manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières," 5.

LUPUS AND VALERIUS MAXIMUS

The year 1891 marks the beginning of modern scholarship concerning Lupus' textual work. It was in this year that L. Traube determined that the revision of the Berne 366, which contains the *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* of Valerius Maximus, was by the hand of Lupus.¹⁰ Traube supposed that Lupus had used this manuscript when, for instruction in Roman history, he dictated to his students extracts he had himself culled from Valerius Maximus. Furthermore, Traube felt that the corrections in the text and in the margin of this manuscript were made by Lupus' own hand. This suggestion was later confirmed by the studies of Traube's pupil J. Schnetz, who showed that in addition to many interlinear and marginal corrections, one whole column of the Berne 366 was copied by Lupus.¹¹

The study of the Valerius Maximus manuscript was continued by W. M. Lindsay, who published an important article on it in 1909.¹² He briefly reviewed the work of Traube and Schnetz which showed, as we have just seen, that Lupus used extracts of Valerius Maximus from the Berne 366 in dictating to his students: these extracts were later published by his student Heiric of Auxerre. This is as far as Traube goes, but Lindsay adds other important facts. According to the editor of the Teubner edition of Valerius Maximus consulted by Lindsay, C. Kempf, the "codex optimus" is the Berne 366 which Kempf claimed was emended by some corrector in the ninth century with the help of a manuscript of Julius Paris' *Epitome* of Valerius: sometimes the readings from the *Epitome* are placed in the margin of the Berne 366, sometimes "engrafted" in the text itself. It seems, according to Lindsay, that the corrections made by Lupus belong to two periods, for the readings from the *Epitome* manuscript are later than the others and are not found in Heiric's edition. Thus, they must have been entered by Lupus later than the time of his dictation. And the fact that it is only the older series of corrections which were prior to the lectures heard by Heiric in 860 (Traube's date), leads Lindsay to suppose that before taking the Berne 366 to the lecture room so that he could dictate passages from it, Lupus must have carefully emended the text. To do this he must have used both his own conjectures and a second manuscript of Valerius Maximus. It is the main purpose of Lindsay's article to ascertain what this manuscript was.

¹⁰ "Untersuchungen zu Ueberlieferungsgeschichte römischer Schriftsteller. 1. Zu Valerius Maximus, etc.," *Sitzungsberichte der Akad. zu München, Phil.-Hist. Klasse* (1891), 307-391 (= Traube, *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, 3, 3-6, 11).

¹¹ *Ein Kritiker des Valerius Maximus im 9. Jahrhundert* (Neuberg a. Donau, 1901).

¹² "The Archetype Codex of Valerius Maximus," *GPh*, 4 (1909), 113-117.

He assumes that the later series of corrections were made by Lupus when he obtained an ancient manuscript of Julius Paris' *Epitome* from the nearby library of Fleury. This manuscript is called by Lupus "vetustus codex," whereas the second is called "novus" by him. Lupus evidently had this borrowed manuscript copied by some of his monks and then, with his own hand, corrected the transcription by using the original whenever he detected some difficulty. Lindsay concludes, then, that Lupus must have used the archetype codex of Valerius Maximus, a fifth century manuscript of Julius Paris' *Epitome*, from which the Berne 366 was copied.

Lindsay included a phototype of the Berne 366 with his article with the hope that the specimen of Lupus' handwriting contained therein would be conducive to the discovery of other manuscripts which Lupus had copied or corrected. This is in fact what happened, as we will discuss below, but first it seems advisable to note briefly Lupus' style and method of copying and correcting¹³ so that we can gain a clearer insight into what the later palaeographers were looking for in their search for other Lupus manuscripts.

LUPUS' CRITICAL TECHNIQUE

Lupus' script is a clear specimen of Carolingian minuscule: it is a compact and uniform script which reveals a skillful and experienced hand. This is hardly surprising, for even while Lupus was a student at Fulda "he was busy in that copying which was to give him and his monastery so many books by Christian, pagan, or barbarian writers."¹⁴ It was at Fulda that Lupus and another student, Gerolf, had corrected a manuscript of Rabanus Maurus' *Commentary on the Book of Numbers*¹⁵ and Lupus alone copied for Count Eberhard of Friuli a large manuscript of the *Leges Francorum et Ripuariorum et Langobardorum et Alamanorum et Bajuvariorum*,¹⁶ a work which contained the national laws of these German tribes; he also adorned this manuscript with a verse of dedication containing his name and that of Eberhard, and with his own drawings to illustrate the text.

Lupus' handwriting shows clear influence of the script of Tours: he has mastered the Tours open 'g'; he avoids the ligature for 'st', except when he is pressed for space; the ligature NT is regularly used at the end of a word; he regularly uses the K form of H; rustic capitals are used in his *Incipits* and *Explicits*.

¹³ The fullest description of Lupus' critical technique is found in G. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*, 9-49. Much of the following section is based on this work.

¹⁴ E. S. Duckett, *Carolingian Portraits* (Ann Arbor, 1962), 163.

¹⁵ *MGH, Epistolae, Karolini Aevi*, 3, 397.

¹⁶ *MGH, Leges, folio*, ed. Part 3, 3, 3-4.

The most characteristic scribal habit of Lupus, however, is found in his method of word division. Most scribes divided Latin words naturally as they were pronounced, but Lupus rigidly adhered to the artificial syllabification taught by Roman grammarians whereby a syllable should begin with as many consonants as are capable of being pronounced. Thus, words like *scrip-si* and *dig-mus*, normally divided by scribes as here noted, would be corrected by Lupus to *scri-psi* and *di-gnus*. This results in a letter ending a line, such as 'p' or 'g', being struck out or expunged and the next line beginning with an inserted 'p' or 'g'. These added letters, by jutting outside the regular alignment, easily call attention to the correction. Lupus not only followed this rule in his own scribal practice, but also made the texts which he corrected conform to it.

A couple of other aspects of Lupus' technique as a text critic are noteworthy. Probably the most significant aspect of his work of revision is the variants which he puts in the margins. The variants are prefixed by the capital 'A' (standing for *alter*, *aliter*, *alibi*, *alias*, *alius*) with dots on either side; the reference is clarified by the use of two or three dots over the marginal variant and the word found in the text. Another characteristic feature is his custom of erasing parts of lines or even whole lines and re-writing them. He does this so skillfully that often the erasure goes undetected or, if it is noticeable, it is impossible to determine what was erased.¹⁷

Lupus showed great respect for textual tradition. If he had two manuscripts of the same author, he would generally preserve the discrepant readings or old readings, resorting only occasionally to emendation. Moreover, he would faithfully follow the archetype, preserving spaces left vacant in the archetype or leaving spaces where the archetype actually was corrupt or appeared to Lupus to be corrupt. In addition to leaving vacant spaces where he thought the passage corrupt, he also marked the passage with the cryphia which often was copied directly from the archetype, but in some places was probably inserted by Lupus himself.

There are other scribal and correctional habits which Lupus shows, but the above are the most peculiar to him and provided the clue for further investigation of other ninth century manuscripts with the hope that still further evidence of Lupus' editorial activities could be found.

¹⁷ For a brief discussion of modern techniques used in attempting to restore erasures in a manuscript, see A. Freeman, "Theodulf of Orléans and the *Libri Carolini*," *Speculum*, 32 (1957), 703-705.

BEESON AND LUPUS

This clue was most successfully followed by C. H. Beeson. Taking advantage of the various hints that had appeared, in 1910 he undertook an investigation to search for manuscripts which once had belonged to Lupus, and to make a study of them. During that year he began his investigation by visiting the libraries of Leyden, Paris, Orleans, and Berne. The search proved fruitful, for he soon was able to point to a number of manuscripts, found by himself and other palaeographers, which contained the corrections or collations of Lupus and one that was written entirely by Lupus. At Paris Beeson found two manuscripts: one, the Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7774 A contains our best witness for the text of the *De inventione* of Cicero;¹⁸ the other, the Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5726,¹⁹ which contains Livy's *Ab urbe condita*, Books VI-X, known to editors of that historian as the "Codex Thuanicus," was later (1929) identified by E. K. Rand.²⁰ The Harleianus 2736, containing Cicero's *De oratore*, was identified by Beeson in the summer of 1910 and in the following winter the Vat. Reg. lat. 597, containing the *Noctes Atticae*, Books I-VIII of Aulus Gellius, was identified by E. A. Lowe while he was examining some Vatican manuscripts for Beeson.²¹ In 1915 W. A. Lindsay discovered that the Vat. Reg. lat. 1484, which contains the *Interpretationes Vergilianae Aeneidos* of Tiberius Claudius Donatus, was corrected by Lupus.²² In 1922 Beeson identified the Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 8623, which contains the *Epistolae*, Books I-VIII of Symmachus; and in 1931 he first noted the Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 6370, which includes Macrobius' *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* and the beginning of his *Saturnalia*, Book I.²³ The last Lupus manuscript that Beeson mentions, in 1945, is the Vienna, Bibl. Nat. Cod. 189, which contains the philosophical corpus of Cicero.²⁴ From the above discussion, therefore, we must agree that Beeson's investigation was very successful, for of the eleven

¹⁸ E. K. Rand and L. W. Jones, *The Earliest Book of Tours*, 103, judge that Lupus took this MS with him to Fulda about 828 "to collate with a copy there that he found even more defective." They would date this MS as having been written between 820-825.

¹⁹ Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*, p. vii, erroneously numbers this MS 7526.

²⁰ *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, p. 95.

²¹ *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*, p. viii.

²² *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), 402. Lindsay says that this MS was "written by Tours scribes and corrected by Lupus of Ferrières." For a description of this MS, see Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, 143.

²³ For a description of this MS, see Rand and Jones, *The Earliest Book of Tours*, 100-101.

²⁴ See Beeson, "The Collectaneum of Hadoard," *CPh*, 40 (1945), 219 and "Lupus of Ferrières and Hadoard," *CPh*, 49 (1948), 191.

manuscripts which we have placed above in our first list of manuscripts identified as having passed through the hands of Lupus, he was responsible for the identification of six.

It was Beeson's goal to publish all of the above-mentioned manuscripts, but he died with this still unaccomplished. One of his students, however, published an account of the Aulus Gellius manuscript which we shall discuss below and Beeson himself brought out the edition of the Harleianus 2736, containing Cicero's *De oratore*, which we have already often referred to. He tells us in the preface of this work that the reason for this codex being published first was that it is the only manuscript which is an autograph copy.²⁵ This manuscript was studied and transcribed by Beeson in 1923 but it was not until 1930 that the entire work was published.

As one might expect from such a scholar as Beeson, his description of the Harley Codex, which is the best of the oldest group of the *mutuli* of the *De oratore*, is clear and complete. The volume consists of two parts. Part one contains the Preface, Table of Contents, and the Introduction, which treats of "Lupus as Scribe and Text Critic"; in this part Beeson gives a detailed history of the manuscript, a lengthy analysis of the work and methods of Lupus under different headings, such as Orthography, Division of Syllables, Punctuation, Abbreviations, Technical Signs, Marginal Corrections, Interlinear Corrections, etc.; there is also a Concordance Table at the end of this section. Part two consists of an excellent reproduction of the Harleianus 2736; this manuscript is a square quarto-codex containing 109 folios which were "ruled with a dry point for two columns with double vertical lines for the text margin; there are twenty-four lines to a column,"²⁶ except for one column which contains twenty-five lines. The text of the *De oratore* stands on Folio 1 Recto to 106 Verso, first column; Folios 106 Verso, second column to 109 Verso contain some Latin poems which have no connection with Cicero.

Beeson maintains that Lupus is the first writer of the Middle Ages to mention Cicero's *De oratore*.²⁷ This occurs in the very first letter of Lupus' correspondence, written about 829-830²⁸ to Einhard. After some introductory remarks in which he declares his devotion to classical learning, Lupus asks Einhard for the loan of several manuscripts: "Sunt autem hi: Tullii *de rhetorica liber*... item eiusdem auctoris *de rhetorica tres libri in disputatione ac dialogo de oratore*..." Beeson assumed that Einhard sent the copy of the

²⁵ *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*, p. viii.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²⁷ This statement is corroborated by M. Manitius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen*. (Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, Beiheft 67, Leipzig, 1935), p. 26.

²⁸ According to Levillain, *Loup de Ferrières, Correspondance*, 1, 2.

De oratore requested by Lupus, for the second mention of this treatise, contained in a letter (*Epist.*, 100) to Pope Benedict III written about 855-858,²⁹ shows that Lupus owned a copy of the *De oratore* at that time: "Petimus etiam Tullium *De oratore* et duodecim libros *Institutionum oratoriarum* Quintilianii, qui uno nec ingenti volumine continentur, quorum utriusque auctorum partes habemus, verum plenitudinem per vos desideramus obtinere." Furthermore, as we have already seen, three of the texts requested by Lupus in this letter to Einhard have come down to us and have been identified as having been criticized by Lupus: the Harleianus 2736, the Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7774 A, and the Vat. Reg. lat. 597. Beeson also assumed that Lupus must have promptly returned the *De oratore* manuscript to Einhard since this was the first such request of the youthful monk from "the distinguished churchman and author."³⁰ This assumption is strengthened by the fact that every page of Lupus' copy shows evidence of the haste in which it was written.

LUPUS AND AULUS GELLIUS

There is another detailed work, complete with facsimile, concerning a manuscript which Lupus is known to have corrected. This is the 1936 dissertation written by Sister L. Meagher, under Beeson's guidance, on the Vat. Reg. Lat. 597, which contains Books IX-XX of Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*.³¹ She points out that the first mention of this work in the Middle Ages,³² as was the case with Cicero's *De oratore*, is found in the first letter of Lupus' correspondence. Here, as we have recently seen, Lupus asks Einhard to send him some manuscripts. After mentioning several other works, Lupus concludes: "praeterea, A. Gellii *noctium Atticarum*." Assurance that this request was granted is found in another letter to Einhard (*Epist.*, 5) written about six years later (836) in which Lupus explains why he has not returned the manuscript: Rabanus Maurus was having a copy of it made for his own use. But Lupus promised that he would return it himself: "A. Gellium misissem nisi rursus illum abbas retinisset, questus necdum sibi cum esse descriptum. Scripturum se vobis dixit quod praefatum librum vi mihi extorsertit. Verum et illum et omnes caeteros, quibus vestra liberalitate fruor, per me, si Deus vult, vobis ipse restituam."

Sr. Meagher compared the Gellius manuscript with other Lupus ma-

nuscripts and found that "the corrections and the marginalia in it exhibit all the earmarks of Lupus' script."³³ It seems that Lupus' technique is about the same throughout all his work. Many of the individual characteristics of this technique can be paralleled in the work of other scribes, but the chance of finding them all together in another scribe is very slight. It is this evidence which definitely established Lupus as the corrector of the Gellius manuscript. By comparing this manuscript with others of Lupus, Sr. Meagher also found that Lupus had revised it more thoroughly than any of the others.³⁴ In fact, the Gellius manuscript, which is written in 121 folios, contains 810 words, even with the omission of proper names, in the marginal index, whereas the *De oratore*, which is written in 106 folios, contains in its marginal index only 111 words.³⁵

A recent article, written by G. I. Lieftinck and concerning a manuscript of Aulus Gellius, makes use of the work of Beeson and Sr. Meagher. In 1953, while visiting different libraries in the Netherlands to make an inventory of manuscripts, Lieftinck came across a manuscript in the library of Leeuwarden which was "un chef d'œuvre de collaboration de scribes insulaires et continentaux de la première moitié du IX^e siècle, de la grande époque carolingienne."³⁶ In his attempt to determine the source of this manuscript Lieftinck refers to the two letters of Lupus which we have just quoted in our discussion of Sr. Meagher's work. Lupus' second letter, written in 836 while he was still a student at Fulda, is especially interesting to Lieftinck. We will recall that in this letter Lupus said that he would have returned a manuscript containing Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* to Einhard except that Rabanus Maurus was having a copy of it made for his own use. Lieftinck is certain that the manuscript which he discovered at Leeuwarden, the Bibl. Prov. de Frise, MS B.A. Fr. 55, is identical with the manuscript which was being prepared.³⁷ To test the validity of this conclusion, he follows the ideas of Sr. Meagher as pointed out in her Chapter IV, which treats the sources of correction of Lupus as found in the second part of the *Noctes Atticae*. Lieftinck compiles several tables to prove that the Reginensis 597 which contains Einhard's original of this work is the basis

²⁹ *The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières*, 17.

³⁰ Cf. Beeson, "The Authorship of 'Quid Sit Ceroma,'" *Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of E. K. Rand* (New York, 1938), 6: "Lupus was quite familiar with the text of Gellius; he revised it more thoroughly than any other of his MSS — he used pen or knife some two thousand times in making changes — and his Gellius marginal index is much the longest."

³¹ *The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières*, 21.

³² "Le MS. d'Aulu-Gelle à Leeuwarden exécuté à Fulda en 836," *Bullettino dell' "Archivio Paleografico Italiano,"* n.s. I (1955), 12.

³³ *Ibid.*, 13.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 2, 120.

³⁰ *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*, 5.

³¹ *The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières*, University of Chicago Dissertation, 1936.

³² This is affirmed by Manitius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren*, p. 147.

for the corrections of Lupus and those found in the manuscript of Leeuwarden. One of the more conclusive charts, in which he compares only two pages of the Reginensis as reproduced by Sr. Meagher with Lupus' corrections and the manuscript of Leeuwarden, is as follows (here abridged):³⁸

	Regin. 597	Corr. Loup	Leeuw.
X,27,3	existimarent	existumarent	existumarent
XI, 2,5	crassator	grassator	grassator
XI,13,2	collocata	colocata	colocata
XI,18,17	obrepetendi	obrependi	obrependi
XII, 5,7	fundatast	fundamentum ratast	fundamentum ratast
XIII,23,19	privativa	privativast	privativast
XIV, 1,23	casus est	casus et	casus et

LUPUS AND SUETONIUS

There has been some question about the history of the introduction of Suetonius' *De Vita Caesarum* into France. According to one view, stated first by L. Traube,³⁹ Lupus secured from the monastery at Fulda either the manuscript of Suetonius that it had or a copy; from this manuscript Lupus dictated certain extracts to his students which were subsequently edited by Heiric of Auxerre, one of Lupus' pupils.⁴⁰ The evidence for this view is a letter (*Epist.*, 35) written by Lupus in 844 to Marcward, abbot of Prüm. After making other requests, Lupus adds:

Quaeso praeterea ut ad sanctum Bonifatium sollertem aliquem monachum dirigatis, qui ex vestra parte Hattonem abbatem⁴¹ deposcat ut vobis Suetonium Tranquillum *de Vita Caesarum*, qui apud eos in duos nec magnos codices divisus est, ad exscribendum dirigat; mihiq[ue] cum aut ipsi, quod nimium opto, afferatis aut, si haec felicitas nostris differatur peccatis, per certissimum nuntium mittendum curetis. Namque in hac regione nusquam invenitur et credimus hoc quoque nos beneficium vestra liberalitate consecuturos.

Commenting on this statement, Ihm says, "Nun wissen wir, dass Lupus sich einen Sueton aus Fulda kommen liess, weil er in Frankreich keinen fand."⁴² According to E. K. Rand, however, Ihm's view is faulty in two

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 15.

³⁹ *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XXVII (1901), 266 f.

⁴⁰ M. Ihm, "Beitraege zur Textgeschichte des Sueton," *Hermes*, 36 (1901), 343-363, published a copy of these extracts. We have already seen above this argument of Traube applied to Lupus' work on Valerius Maximus.

⁴¹ He was abbot of Fulda at this time.

⁴² "Beitraege zur Textgeschichte des Sueton," 344; this view is echoed by J. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1920), 1, 661, who says, "Servatus Lupus, who could find no MS of Suetonius in France, borrowed the Fulda MS."

respects: first, Lupus' request does not prove that he did not know of any other manuscripts of this work in France; "in hac regione" is not perforce synonymous with all of France — he could have simply meant the diocese of Sens, since Ferrières was in this diocese, to distinguish it not only from Germany, but perhaps from the neighboring diocese of Tours as well; second, there is no surety that Lupus' request for the manuscript was granted.⁴³

Rand continues in this very detailed article — in fact it is so detailed that a brief summary of it is impossible — to disprove the theory generally accepted before his writing (1926) that the text of the *De vita Caesarum* was introduced into France through Lupus, who was successful in his appeal to Fulda. This argument is strengthened by Rand's careful examination of the manuscripts of Suetonius, which show no traces of the script of Fulda. There is a manuscript of Suetonius, however, the Memmianus, which Rand believes was written at Tours some two decades or more before Lupus' appeal to Marcward.⁴⁴ Rand conjectures that Lupus knew of this manuscript, "but remembering also the sumptuous edition in two volumes at Fulda, Lupus tried for the best... Failing to secure a copy of the Fulda manuscript, he succeeded at Tours. Either the codex was transcribed for him there, or it was loaned to him at Ferrières for that purpose... No direct descendants of Lupus's copy, save through the *Excerpts*, have been detected."⁴⁵ Finally, using evidence gathered by textual criticism, palaeography, and history, Rand concludes that the *De vita Caesarum* was not introduced into France by Lupus somewhat later than 844, but actually some thirty years or more before that time — probably by Einhard or some other person of Charlemagne's circle.⁴⁶

LUPUS AND MACROBIUS

We pointed out above that in 1931 Beeson identified the Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 6370, which contains Macrobius' *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* and the beginning of his *Saturnalia*, Book I, as being thoroughly revised by Lupus.⁴⁷ According to Beeson,⁴⁸ this may have been the manuscript re-

⁴³ "On the History of the *De Vita Caesarum* of Suetonius in the Early Middle Ages," *HSCP*, 37 (1926), 20.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 39.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 39.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁴⁷ Cf. Rand and Jones, *The Earliest Book of Tours*, 100-101; the following description of this MS is taken from them.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 101.

ferred to by Lupus in a letter to Adalgaudus.⁴⁹ There are four main hands identifiable of which Lupus is identified as Hand C. His revisions are for the most part written in erasure, except for two folios which have been inserted by him.⁵⁰ On one page the original scribe wrote to the bottom of the page and thus left no room for a diagram but Lupus erased most of the page, rewrote the section with corrections, and compressed it by using many abbreviations; thus, he was able to provide space for the diagram which was subsequently supplied. This leaf is especially characteristic of Lupus' scribal technique.⁵¹

LUPUS AND QUINTILIAN

Our final discussion will be concerned about Lupus' relationship with Quintilian. Until the ninth century Quintilian was intermittently studied, but P. Lehmann has recently shown that this century marked a revival in the study of Quintilian; this is seen from the many important manuscripts of this author which can be dated as of the ninth century.⁵² Lehmann points out that by this time the manuscript tradition had broken down into two classes: the complete tradition existed in Germany, but in France manuscripts circulated which lacked various books; these manuscripts are designated *mutili*.⁵³ It seems that Lupus had such a *mutilus* which he tried to expand by getting a complete text.

Lupus' first attempt to get another copy of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* was in 852 when he sent a letter to Altsigus of York. After asking him to send several manuscripts containing works of Jerome and Bede, Lupus concluded: "praeterea Quintiliani *Institutionum oratoriarum* libros XII per certissimos nuntios mihi ad cellam sancti Judoci... dirigatis..." (*Epist.*, 87). It appears that this request was not granted,⁵⁴ for several years later we

⁴⁹ "Habeo vero tibi plurimas gratias, quod in Macrobio corrigendo fraternum adhibuisti laborem, quamquam librum, cujus mihi ex eodem folium direxisti, praecipitarem videre. Est enim revera venerabilis et exactissimae diligentiae." *Epist.*, 21.

⁵⁰ A. La Penna, "Le Parisinus Latinus 6370 et le Texte des *Commentarii* de Macrobe," *Revue de Philologie*, 24 (1950), 180, n. 1, conjectures that this is the *folium* which Lupus received from Adalgaudus; Lupus then, seeing that this leaf was more correct than that of his own MS, "La recopie et a inséré cette copie à la place des feuillets correspondants dans son propre manuscrit."

⁵¹ For a representation of this leaf, see Rand and Jones, *The Earliest Book of Tours*, Plate 46.

⁵² "Die *Institutio oratoria* des Quintilianus im Mittelalter," *Philologus*, 89 (1934), 349-383.

⁵³ See P. S. Boskoff, "Quintilian in the Late Middle Ages," *Speculum*, 27 (1952), 76, n. 5, for a list of the lacunae in the *mutilo* tradition.

⁵⁴ Cf. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*, 4, who says: "He had attempted to secure copies of the Jerome Commentary and of Quintilian from Altsigus of York (849) but evidently without success." Levillain, *Loup de Ferrières, Correspondance*, 2, 78, dates this letter as of 852, not 849, which is Beeson's date.

find him again requesting a complete text, this time from Pope Benedict III: "Petimus etiam Tullium *De oratore* et duodecim libros *Institutionum oratoriarum* Quintiliani, quo uno nec ingenti volumine continentur; quorum utriusque auctorum partes habemus, verum plenitudinem per vos desideramus obtinere." (*Epist.*, 100). The knowledgeable way in which Lupus describes the Quintilian manuscript indicates that he knew the Pope had such a manuscript; perhaps Lupus had seen it in 849 when, at the behest of Charles the Bald, he had gone to Rome on a mission to Benedict's predecessor, Leo IV. Boskoff supposes that again Lupus' request was not answered because "the mutilated version remained in circulation from approximately this time until the discovery of a complete text by the humanists in the fifteenth century."⁵⁵ Lehmann traces the proliferation of *mutili* to Fleury, under the initiative of Lupus from nearby Ferrières.⁵⁶

There is just such a manuscript, the Berne 351, which seems to have its origin at Fleury. It has usually been considered a tenth century manuscript, but Lehmann thought that he detected certain characteristics of Lupus' method in it. Therefore, he asked Beeson for his opinion and received the following reply in a letter dated July 9, 1932: "The Bernensis in format and script is very like some of the mss. of Lupus. It has the cryphia and \bar{q} (= *quaere*) and N^o in the margin; even the curious reference-marks are the same as those sometimes employed by Lupus, but the script of the corrector is not that of Lupus."⁵⁷ Lehmann accepted Beeson's opinion; he did show, however, that this manuscript dates from the ninth century and not from the tenth. Giuseppe Billanovich, the latest scholar to discuss the Berne 351, says that it is "vicino a Lupo."⁵⁸

Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

⁵⁵ "Quintilian in the Late Middle Ages," 71.

⁵⁶ "Die *Institutio oratoria* des Quintilianus im Mittelalter," 357.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 356.

⁵⁸ "Dall' antica Ravenna alle Biblioteche Umanistiche," *Aevum*, 30 (1956), 329.