

2083815

# STUDI MEDIEVALI

SERIE TERZA

7

XVII

112

1976

CENTRO ITALIANO DI STUDI SULL'ALTO MEDIOEVO  
SPOLETO

## NOTE

### Three Carolingian Texts Attributed to Laon: Reconsiderations

In the course of research on the ninth-century cathedral school at Laon, I was led inevitably to examine the authenticity of three texts which had been attributed to the school. Two of the texts, a collection of Greek notes known as the *Scholica Graecarum glossarum* and a commentary on the *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, had been attributed to the most important Laon master, Martin Hiberniensis (819-875), sometimes also known as Martin of Laon, Martin the Irishman, or Martin Scottus. The third text is an interesting letter from a student, known only by his initial, *A*, to his master, similarly identified only by his initial, *E*. The *Scholica* and the letter, I soon decided, could not be assigned to Laon. I later came to the conclusion that the arguments for attributing the Martianus Capella commentary to Martin Hiberniensis do not deserve the confidence that has been accorded to them <sup>(1)</sup>.

Negative criticism of one's predecessors is never very pleasant to write – especially when a new attribution cannot be offered to replace an older one that has been cast into doubt. But such criticism does serve a useful scholarly purpose. It awakens new

Research for this article was facilitated by the following institutions: Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City; Bibliothèque Municipale, Laon; Burgerbibliothek, Bern; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, Paris. Grants from the Penrose Fund of the American Philosophical Society and the XI Summer Research Grant of the Purdue Research Foundation supported the writing of this article.

(1) I accepted the commentary and the *Scholica Graecarum glossarum* as authentic works of Martin in my 1971 dissertation for Michigan State University, a revised version of which is to be published soon by the Argeo Gesellschaft as *The School of Laon from 850 to 930: Its Manuscripts and Masters*. The letter from *A* to *E* was examined in Appendix D of the dissertation. My new stand on the commentary and the *Scholica* have been outlined briefly in the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, III, ed. F. EDWARD CRANZ, Washington, D.C., 1976, pp. 451-52, and in a paper presented at the first Saint Louis Conference on Manuscript Studies (see *Manuscripta* XIX, 1975, p. 70).

interest in texts and stimulates the investigations and reassessments that are such a vital part of scholarship. It is in that spirit that I offer a reconsideration of the texts in question.

#### THE LETTER FROM A TO E

The letter from *A* to his master, *E*, contains numerous details and allusions that should have facilitated the identification of *A* and *E*, yet their full names continue to elude scholars<sup>(2)</sup>. The search for their identities is of more than antiquarian interest since the letter contains the key to many of the interrelationships among the schools of the ninth century.

*A* was acquainted with the work of John Scottus; he knew Manno of Laon personally and mentioned a meeting with him at the palace at Compiègne; he wrote that he confided some of his works to a «dearly beloved» Teutbertus; other works he sent to a Bishop *L* whom I am inclined to believe must be Liuddo of Autun (866-874); he also knew Bishop Isaac of Langres (856-880); he asked the recipient of his letter to remember two youths from Saint Amand; he resented the fact that a recent bishop had been installed in his see by the king rather than by the people; another friend was a «venerable» dean, Fulcoldus; he also referred to a Burgardus, provost of the monastery of Saint Mary; *A* asked *E* to undertake the education of two religious of this monastery: the daughter of Count Baldwin of Flanders and Judith (daughter of the Charles the Bald) and the other, a relative of his («*mea consobrina*»)<sup>(3)</sup>. Interspersed among these names are requests for information on various scholarly topics in which *A* exhibited his acquaintance with the works of Martianus Capella, Fulgentius, Virgil, Aulus Gellius, Terence, Jerome, Philo Judaeus, and Donatus. A second, less detailed letter from an *H* to the «famous and celebrated» master *A* follows the letter from *A* to *E*<sup>(4)</sup>. Presumably,

(2) The letter, too long to be reproduced here, was published by ERNST DÜMMER, in *MGH, Ep.*, VI, pp. 182-86.

(3) For Manno, Liuddo, and Isaac, see my forthcoming monograph cited in n. 1 above. I have not been able to discover anything about Teutbertus or Burgardus. For the many ninth-century Fulcos, the short form of Fulcoldus, see GERHARD SCHNEIDER, *Erzbischof Fulco von Reims (883-900) und das Frankenreich*, Munich, 1973, pp. 2-6. A Fulcoldus, «*ex coenobio sancti Juliani clericus*», is mentioned in Heiric of Auxerre's *Miracula sancti Germani*, PL, 124, col. 1261d.

(4) *MGH, Ep.*, VI, pp. 186-87.

the recipient of the second letter is the *A* who wrote the first letter.

The letter from *A* to *E* has been studied several times. Ernst Dümmler discussed it at some length and assigned it to the early 870s<sup>(5)</sup>. Any daughter of Baldwin and Judith, who were married in 862, must have been at least ten years old when her education with a famous master was contemplated. Dümmler assumed that Charles the Bald was the king who interfered with an episcopal election and thus set the *terminus ante quem* for the letter at 877, the date of Charles's death. The letter, however, does not refer to the king by name. In any case, it must have been written before 880, the year Isaac of Langres died.

Max Manitius repeated the details furnished by Dümmler<sup>(6)</sup>. M.L.W. Laistner was the first to detect the author's knowledge of Fulgentius in the letter<sup>(7)</sup>. He made no attempt to identify the author of the letter. André Van de Vyver provided the most important discussion of the letter in a two-page footnote in an article on Hucbald of Saint Amand<sup>(8)</sup>. He dated the letter to 870, the year that Charles the Bald installed the archbishop of Cologne contrary to the wishes of the clergy and people of that city. He also argued that the letter was not written at Laon, but sent there. Master *E* was asked to supervise the education of the two religious who belonged, in Van de Vyver's view, to Saint Mary's at Laon (Notre-Dame-la-Profonde). Finally, Van de Vyver identified *E* as Heiric of Auxerre who, according to Van de Vyver's interpretation of Laon, Bibl. mun., 107, was teaching at Laon around 870<sup>(9)</sup>. The second letter, from *H* to *A*, was written by Heiric who used *H* instead of *E* to signify his name. According to Van de Vyver, it was Heiric, *E* in one letter, *H* in the other, who collected and preserved the letters rather than *A*, the author of the first and recipient of the second.

(5) *Briefe und Verse des neunten Jahrhunderts*, in *Neues Archiv*, XIII (1888), pp. 345-48. Dümmler, however, confused Manno of Laon with Manno of Saint Oyan.

(6) *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, I, Munich, 1911, pp. 335, 488, n. 5.

(7) *Fulgentius in the Carolingian Age*, in *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages: Selected Essays by M. L. W. Laistner* (ed. CHESTER G. STARR), New York, 1966, pp. 207-9.

(8) *Hucbald de Saint-Amand, écolâtre, et l'invention du Nombre d'Or*, in *Mélanges Auguste Pelzer: Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de la scolastique médiévale* (Université de Louvain: Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie Louvain, 1947, ser. 3, fasc. 26), p. 62, n. 12.

(9) For this manuscript and Heiric's connection with it, see GIUSEPPE BILLANOVICH, *Dall'antica Ravenna alle biblioteche umanistiche*, in *Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Annuario*, 1955-56, pp. 89-90.

Riccardo Quadri, in his exhaustive study of Heiric's life, was not convinced by Van de Vyver. He rightly dismissed Van de Vyver's dependence on Laon, Bibl. mun., 107 and warned that it would be hazardous to attribute the letters to Heiric on the basis of similar initials alone<sup>(10)</sup>. Recently, Bernard Merlette once again provisionally identified *E* with Heiric<sup>(11)</sup>.

An examination of the manuscript which contains the letters is most rewarding and may shed new light on the identity of the individuals mentioned in them. Leiden, Voss. lat. oct. 88 is a scholastic miscellany written probably early in the tenth century. It is a composite manuscript, both parts of which were owned by Pierre Daniel, the lawyer from Orléans<sup>(12)</sup>. Folios 96r-111v belong to a manuscript of the fourteenth century and can be ignored here.

The letter from *A* to *E* was impeccably transcribed by Dümmler except in one place where he made a crucial error. On folio 24r, in reference to the two nuns, Dümmler read « Quod superest: in monte sanctae Mariae sunt duae sanctimoniales »<sup>(13)</sup>. His footnote explained « i.e. Laudunensi, qui mons Lauduni vocatur, cf. Flodoard Ann. a. 951 ». Everyone who has discussed the letter has followed Dümmler and assumed that it concerned Laon. The manuscript, however, reads (folio 24r, l. 15) « in monst̄ sanctae Mariae ». The abbreviated word is *monasterio*, not *monte*. *Monst̄* occurs seven lines later in the manuscript and is correctly transcribed as *monasterii* by the editor.

This emendation throws new light on the problem. The daughter of Baldwin and the *consobrina* of *A* could have belonged to any number of monasteries dedicated to Mary. It is not at all certain that they were members of the community at Laon.

The script and some of the contents of the Leiden manuscript indicate that it originated in the region embracing Tours, Orléans, Fleury, and Auxerre<sup>(14)</sup>. The fact that Pierre Daniel

(10) *I Collectanea di Eirico di Auxerre*, Fribourg, 1966 (Spicilegium Friburgense, vol. 11), p. 17, n. 1.

(11) *Ecoles et bibliothèques, à Laon, du déclin de l'Antiquité au développement de l'université*, in *Actes du 95e Congrès national des sociétés savantes (Reims, 1970): Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610*, 1, Paris, 1975, p. 37, n. 90. Dümmler, *Briefe und Verse*, p. 348, suggested that *H* might be Bishop Herifrid (887-909) of Auxerre.

(12) Folio 2r: « Ex libb. Petri Danielis Aurellii, 1560 »; f. 111v: « Ex libb. Petri Danielis, Aurellii, 1564 ».

(13) See MGH, *Ep.*, VI, p. 186, l. 15.

(14) Marginal verses in hands of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries between ff. 80v-95r refer to Chartres, Orléans, Paris, and Sens (See DUMMLER, *Briefe und Verse*, p. 345).

owned it in the sixteenth century also points specifically to Fleury or Auxerre. The first gathering of the manuscript is missing<sup>(15)</sup>. An unidentified commentary occupies folios 2r-10v<sup>(16)</sup>. Folios 11r-18r contain more than 275 Greek and Latin etymologies from classical authors. At least thirty-seven of these entries came from the same source as the *Scholica Graecarum glossarum* edited by M. L. W. Laistner<sup>(17)</sup>.

Folios 18v-25v contain a poem attributed to Gottschalk of Orbais and the two letters published by Dümmler<sup>(18)</sup>. Folios 26r-39v contain a *De dialectica* attributed in the manuscript to Augustine<sup>(19)</sup>. Folios 40r-41v bear an unidentified glossary of twenty-six Greek rhetorical and grammatical terms. The same glossary is also found in two tenth-century manuscripts now at Bern: Burgerbibliothek 172 and 184<sup>(20)</sup>. The former belonged to Pierre Daniel and came from Fleury. The script of the glosses in this manuscript is quite close to, but not identical to, that of the Leiden codex. Bern, Burgerbibliothek 184 belonged to Jacob Bongar who inherited some of Daniel's manuscripts<sup>(21)</sup>. Thus, the glossary in the Leiden manuscript would seem to have originated in the Fleury-Auxerre region.

Folios 42r-42v contain an excerpt from an unidentified commentary<sup>(22)</sup>. Folios 43v-48v bear glosses on Greek grammar<sup>(23)</sup>.

(15) Folio 7v is signed with a « ii ». Folio 14v is signed « iii ». The remaining gatherings are unsigned. A gathering is missing between ff. 79-80; see below n. 24.

(16) The commentary seems to be on the *Categoriae*. The first sentence on f. 2r is, « Hoc autem profertur scilicet homo iustus et iniustus ». Boethius is cited on this leaf. The commentary ends with « Sic fiunt reliquae varietatis ».

(17) See *Notes on Greek from the Lectures of a Ninth Century Monastery Teacher*, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, VII (1923); pp. 421-56. Laistner thought that there were only « a dozen or so » *Scholica* entries in the Leiden manuscript (*ibid.*, p. 424). However, he was following Georg Goetz's *partial* edition of these notes; see *Corpus glossariorum latinorum*, 7 vols., Leipzig, 1888-1923, V, pp. 657-60.

(18) For the poem, see MGH, *Ep.*, VI, pp. 180-82.

(19) See AUGUSTINE, *De dialectica*, trans. B. DARRELL JACKSON from the text of JAN PINBORG, *Synthese Historical Library*, vol. 16, Dordrecht and Boston, 1975, pp. 9, 77.

(20) See HERMANN HAGEN, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium*, Bern, 1875, pp. 237, 240. The glossary was published from the two Bern manuscripts by HAGEN, *Scholica Bernensia ad Vergilii Bucolica atque Georgica*, in *Jahrbücher für classisches Philologie: Supplementband*, 4 (1867) pp. 984-87.

(21) E. K. RAND, *Studies in the Script of Tours, I: A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours, I: Text*, Cambridge, Mass., 1929, p. 203, examined and rejected this manuscript as a Tours product. It does exhibit some characteristics of the Tours style.

(22) The commentary begins: « Indandis et reliqua. Indandis numeribus quinque requiruntur, quis, cui, quid, quale, quantum ».

(23) Folio 45v is blank. The glosses begin: « DE NOMINE. Omnia nomina graeca in capite suo [?] litteram habentia in medio loco cum p et aspiratione adiuncta scribentur apud Latinos ut phoebus, ephoebus ».

The remainder of the manuscript contains Prosper's *Epigrammata ex sententiis sancti Augustini* (folios 48r-79v) and centos from the *Aeneid* (folios 80r-94v) <sup>(24)</sup>.

The identification of the anonymous commentaries and glosses should help to localize further the author (or authors) of the letters included among them. As far as I can see, all this material was compiled at Fleury or somewhere nearby and not at Laon.

#### THE «SCHOLICA GRAECARUM GLOSSARUM»

M.L.W. Laistner in 1923 published the *Scholica*, 349 Latin definitions of latinized Greek words arranged in alphabetical order, under the name of Martin Hiberniensis, an attribution that has been followed since <sup>(25)</sup>. Laistner's edition of the *Scholica* was based on two manuscripts, Vatican, Reg. lat. 215, copied in 876 or 877, and London, British Library, Royal 15 A XVI, a codex of the tenth century. Three additional manuscripts of the *Scholica* have come to light since 1923: Ripoll 74, copied between 935 and 977; Paris, B.N., lat. 4883A, an eleventh-century manuscript probably copied from the Vatican codex at Saint Martial in Limoges; and, Oxford, Barlow 35, from the early eleventh century. The new manuscripts all entitle the notes, *Scholica Graecarum glossarum*. There are only inconsequential differences among these five witnesses to the *Scholica*. As already noted Leiden, Voss. lat. oct. 88 contains thirty-seven of the *Scholica* entries but without any title and in unalphabetized order <sup>(26)</sup>.

In addition to the discovery of new manuscripts, it has also been determined that Remigius of Auxerre had access to the *Scho-*

(24) The *Epigrammata* end at « Iratus sineret, quod prohibet placidus » (PL, 51, col. 528d) and the selections from the *Aeneid* begin with « Tum vero trenefacta novis per pectora cunctis insinuat pavor » (II, ll. 228-29). A gathering between ff. 79-80 has been lost from the manuscript.

(25) See above, n. 17, and MANITIUS, *Geschichte*, III, p. 1062; JAMES F. KENNEY, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical (An Introduction and Guide)*, rev. ed. by LUDWIG BIELER, New York, 1966, p. 591; MAIEUL CAPPUYNS, *Jean Scot Erigène, Sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée*, Brussels, 1933 (repr. 1969), p. 65, n. 1; H. WAQUET, ed., *Abbon, Le siège de Paris par les Normands, poème du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1964, p. xii, n. 1; CORA E. LUTZ (ed.), *DUNCHAD Glossae in Martianum*, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1944, p. xii, n. 9; JEAN G. PRÉAUX, *Le commentaire de Martin de Laon sur l'oeuvre de Martianus Capella*, in *Latomus*, XII (1953), pp. 443, 448, 458; BERNHARD BISCHOFF, *Das griechische Element in der abendländischen Bildung des Mittelalters*, in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, II, Stuttgart, 1967, p. 266; CLAUDIO LEONARDI, *Nuove voci poetiche tra secolo IX e XI, in Studi Medievali*, 3rd ser., II (1961), pp. 146, n. 31; p. 149, n. 54.

(26) See above, n. 17.

*lica* and used them in his Martianus Capella commentary. Abbo of Saint Germain-des-Prés in the late ninth century drew upon the *Scholica* for the difficult and rare vocabulary he inserted into his *Bella Parisiaca urbis*, especially in the third book which accompanies it. That the *Scholica* continued to be copied after the time of Remigius and Abbo suggests that they enjoyed a more than modest fortune among medieval teachers and writers.

Laistner attributed the *Scholica* to Martin because he believed that one of the two manuscripts he knew came from Laon <sup>(27)</sup>. The source of his information was a « guess » made by H. J. Thompson: « *Anaphus* looks like the creation of some graecising teacher. . . Who this was we may guess with some probability. I learn from Professor Lindsay that Cod. Vat. Reg. 215 was written in 876 at Laon, where Greek was taught by Martin the Irishman; and though Martin died in 875 it is likely enough that the «scholica graecarum glossarum» represent some of his teaching » <sup>(28)</sup>. Nowhere in his article of 1923 or his six subsequent discussions of the *Scholica* did Laistner present further evidence that the text was indeed «lecture notes» copied down and preserved by a pupil of Martin <sup>(29)</sup>.

Vatican, Reg. lat. 215, contains a note of provenance although, unfortunately, it is quite cryptic <sup>(30)</sup>. At the top of folio 1r stands the truncated *ex-libris*, « Hic liber est scē Mar ». The name of the establishment to which the manuscript belonged is incomplete because the corner of the leaf which bears the *ex-libris* has been torn away. F. Arevalo, an eighteenth-century Spanish scholar, suggested that the *ex-libris* should be completed as « S. Marii Forcalqueriensis » <sup>(31)</sup>. Bethmann, in 1874, suggested that the name in question was « S. Marie » <sup>(32)</sup>. In 1895, Bruno Güterbock noticed that a series of Old Testament glosses found elsewhere in the Va-

(27) *Candalabrum Theodosianum*, in *The Classical Quarterly*, XVI (1922), p. 107.

(28) M. L. W. LAISTNER, *Anaphus*, in *The Classical Review*, XXXIV (1920), pp. 32-33.

(29) He returned to the *Scholica* in *Abbo of St. Germain-des-Prés*, in *Bulletin Du Cange*, I (1925), pp. 27-31; *The Revival of Greek in Western Europe in the Carolingian Age in History IX* (1924), pp. 177-187; *Martianus Capella and His Ninth Century Commentators*, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, IX (1925), pp. 130-38; *Rivipullensis 71 and the Scholica of Martin of Laon*, in *Mélanges Mandonnet*, II, Paris, 1930, pp. 32-37, and in *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900*, Ithaca, 1957, pp. 215, 244.

(30) See ANDRÉ WILMART, *Codices Regenses Latini (Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae): Codices 1-250*, Vatican City, 1937, pp. 507-12; and JOHN J. CONTRENI, *The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus Eriugena*, in *Speculum*, LI (1976), pp. 411-34.

(31) See PL, 81, col. 825.

(32) See *Archiv*, XII (1874), p. 270.

tican manuscript contained several Old Irish words. In addition, many of these glosses were preceded by the letters *IO* or *IOH* and *AI* or *HAI* which Güterbock interpreted as abbreviations for John Scottus and Haimo, one of the masters of Heiric of Auxerre. Armed with this evidence, with Bethmann's reconstruction of the *ex-libris*, and with the evidence of his friend, Ludwig Traube, Güterbock concluded that the manuscript most probably came from Laon whose cathedral was dedicated to Mary<sup>(33)</sup>. In 1913, Manitius went one step further and claimed that the manuscript was copied at Laon<sup>(34)</sup>. In the meantime, however, Traube, who had initially followed Bethmann and suggested the Laon attribution to Güterbock, examined the manuscript in 1902 and attributed it to Tours on paleographic grounds. He suggested that the *ex-libris* should read «Hic liber est sancti Martini Turonensis» which, in light of the definite feminine ending of *sanctae*, hardly has merit<sup>(35)</sup>.

In 1913, H. M. Bannister challenged Traube's view and was the first to insist on the distinction between the origin and provenance of the manuscript. The truncated *ex-libris*, Bannister wisely decided, was much too vague to serve as an indication of provenance. As for its origin, the manuscript reminded him of many copied at Fleury<sup>(36)</sup>. When E. K. Rand later made his study of Tours manuscripts, he wrote that the paleographic argument of his master, Traube, which attributed the manuscript to Tours was insufficient. Nevertheless, he accepted Vatican, Reg. lat., 215 into his catalogue with the simple note, «A book of Tours according to Traube's later view»<sup>(37)</sup>.

This conclusion, built on such slender grounds, has been accepted by the editor of the catalogue of the Regina manuscripts<sup>(38)</sup>. To my knowledge, no one has reconciled the different attributions of Traube, Manitius, and Bannister or definitely settled the ques-

(33) *Aus irischen Handschriften in Turin und Rom*, in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*, XXXIII (1895), pp. 103-5.

(34) *Geschichte*, I, p. 470.

(35) *Palaeographisches Anzeigen*, in *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, F. Boll (ed.), III (Munich, 1965), p. 234. For his earlier attribution to Laon, see *MGH, P.L.*, III, p. 753; and GÜTERBOCK, *Aus irischen Handschriften*, p. 103.

(36) *Monumenta vaticani di paleografia musicale latine: Raccolti ed Illustrati*, Leipzig, 1913 (Codices e Vaticanis selecti phototypice expressi, vol. 12), p. 29.

(37) *Studies*, pp. 8-9, 41, 182.

(38) WILMART, *Codices*, p. 512, who remarks of this manuscript: «summa diligentia discussa est, non semper summa sagacitate».

tion. I do not believe that the origin or the provenance of the manuscript can be traced to Laon. Paleographically, the manuscript does not resemble the handful of late ninth- and early tenth-century manuscripts produced in Laon's modest scriptorium. Furthermore, the *ex-libris* of the Vatican manuscript does not resemble any of the notices of ownership, from many different periods, that are found in the Laon manuscripts<sup>(39)</sup>.

Two additional considerations reinforce the case for reopening the question of the source of the *Scholica Graecarum glossarum*. First, there is no evidence of which I know in Martin's manuscripts of the teaching which the *Scholica* are supposed to represent. Secondly, one of the three manuscripts of the *Scholica* which has come to light since 1923, the tenth-century Ripoll 74, seems to have been copied from a Visigothic archetype to judge from orthographical variations and problems of word separation<sup>(40)</sup>. The existence of such an archetype places the home of the *Scholica* far from Laon.

If Martin was not the source of the *Scholica*, who then was? I doubt that the source will ever be identified. I do believe, however, that the *Scholica* are earlier than the last quarter of the ninth century. The earliest surviving manuscript of the Greek notes, the Vatican codex, is not the earliest representative of the *Scholica*. For the gloss on *anabolarium*, this codex warns against the erroneous readings of other, presumably earlier, manuscripts<sup>(41)</sup>. Interestingly, when Abbo of Saint Germain-des-Prés consulted the *Scholica*, he used a text which carried the faulty spelling of *anabolarium*, which would indicate that the textual tradition to which he had access was not that of the Vatican manuscript or of any of the others which have survived. Spelling

(39) In response to my inquiry, Bernhard Bischoff kindly offered the following opinion:

• Bezüglich der Entstehung des Reg. lat. 215 scheinen mir die Ausführungen von Dom. Wilmarth im Catal. das wichtigste zu enthalten; nur kann man nicht auf Grund der 2 von einem in Tours geschalteten Schreiber stammenden Zeilen auf fol. 112r (Unziale u. Halbunziale) Herkunft des (ganzen) Codex aus Tours behaupten, mit dessen wohlbekannten Stil die Hs. sonst nichts zu tun hat. Dieser eine Schreiber kann gereist sein. Ich würde die Heimat der Hs. weiter westlich suchen (als in Laon); wichtig kann es sein wenn (nach A. W.) wirklich ein Ueberlieferungszusammenhang mit dem aus dem Limousin kommenden Paris. lat. 4883A besteht (Letter, 13 March 1975).

(40) See JUAN LAURIO, *Los glosarios de Ripoll*, in *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, IV (1928), pp. 271-341, especially pp. 289-91; ID., *Los glosarios de Ripoll*, *ibid.*, III (1927), pp. 331-90; and LLOIS NICOLAU D'OLIVER, *Un glossaire de Virgile et Juvenal*, in *Bulletin Du Cange*, IV (1928), pp. 104-13, 137-52.

(41) See LAISTNER, *Notes on Greek*, p. 429 (A 71).

errors in both Abbo's excerpts from the *Scholica* and in the Ripoll manuscript of the *Scholica* likewise indicate an earlier date for their compilation. Both Abbo and Ripoll 74 use *u* for *a*, a mistake occasioned most probably by the open minuscule *a* in the early copies of the text <sup>(42)</sup>.

The fact that Ripoll 74 shows signs of an earlier Visigothic archetype warrants considering Spain as the ultimate home of the notes. The fact also that most of the *Scholica* and, indeed, most of the « Miscellaneous Notes » which Laistner published with them are excerpts from Isidore of Seville strengthens this hypothesis.

How Abbo came to know the *Scholica* cannot be told with any precision although the relationships between his monastery and Ripoll offer an obvious possibility <sup>(43)</sup>. Remigius of Auxerre's use of the *Scholica* is, however, susceptible of closer analysis – the school of Auxerre seems to have been a major center for the diffusion of the *Scholica*.

Vatican, Reg. lat. 215, as already noted, was copied in 876 or 877. Although its origin and provenance are unknown, its contents bear witness to the influence of John Scottus, Haimo of Auxerre, and Gottschalk of Orbais. Of the last, there is a fragment from his grammatical anthology <sup>(44)</sup>. A series of biblical glosses collected from the teaching of John Scottus and Haimo of Auxerre are also found in the codex <sup>(45)</sup>. In addition, among the « Miscellaneous Notes » which Laistner published with the *Scholica*, there is an explication of a Greek line from a poem of John Scottus. The poem was composed in 862 <sup>(46)</sup>. Whoever compiled the *Scholica* and the other glosses between this date and 876/877 most likely was connected with the masters whose works are included in the manuscript.

Remigius of Auxerre was familiar with the *Scholica*, the biblical glosses, and glosses on the prologues of Jerome which the

(42) See *Bella Parisiaca urbis*, III, 88 (MGH, P.L., IV-I, p. 120); and, LAISTNER, *Abbo of St-Germain-des-Près*, pp. 28-30.

(43) See RUDOLF BEER, *Die Handschriften des Klosters Santa Maria de Ripoll*, in *Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, 155, 3te Abhandlungen, 1907, pp. 38-39, 91-95.

(44) See WILMART, *Codices*, p. 510.

(45) See CONTRENI, *The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus Eriugena*, pp. 411-34.

(46) See LAISTNER, *Greek Notes*, p. 451, note 60. The verse is from John's poem in the preface of his translation of Dionysius the Areopagite, see MGH, P.L., III, p. 548, l. 21.

manuscript also contains. The obvious intermediary between Remigius and John Scottus and Haimo of Auxerre is Remigius's own master, Heiric of Auxerre. One of Heiric's talents was the compilation of pedagogical texts reminiscent of the *Scholica Graecarum glossarum*. His *Collectanea* and *Scholica quaestionum*, based on the teaching of Lupus of Ferrières and Haimo of Auxerre, is one of these texts. In this connection, it should be remembered that thirty-seven of the *Scholica* entries appear in Leiden, Voss. lat. oct. 88. In this manuscript, which seems to come from the region of Fleury and Auxerre, the *Scholica* entries appear in unalphabetized order reflecting perhaps their application to a text <sup>(47)</sup>.

With the Laon origin and provenance of the Vatican manuscript, Laistner's sole reason for attributing the *Scholica* to Martin, now extremely doubtful, the Laon master's claim to the notes must now be judged as unfounded. I once thought that Laistner came indirectly to the same conclusion. After he first published the *Scholica* he later discovered that many of the notes came from a commentary on Martianus Capella. His comparison of the *Scholica* led him to believe that the ninth century produced a fourth commentary on the *De nuptiis* in addition to those of John Scottus, Duncaht of Reims, and Remigius of Auxerre. This fourth commentary, Laistner suggested, might have been that of Martin. In 1953, Jean G. Præaux did, in fact, attribute a Martianus Capella commentary to Martin, the very same commentary that had earlier been attributed to Duncaht <sup>(48)</sup>. However, of this putative Duncaht commentary, Laistner wrote, « clearly the source of the *Scholica graecarum* is not the commentary of Duncaht » <sup>(49)</sup>. The comparison which I have made between the *Scholica* items and the commentaries of « Martin-Duncaht », of John Scottus, and of Remigius of Auxerre, support this conclusion. Martin-Duncaht and John seem to be ignorant of the *Scholica*, whereas, as Laistner saw, Remigius of Auxerre consulted them frequently in his own commentary. The finding that the commentary attributed to Martin and the *Scholica* do not coincide would be an absolute proof that Martin's lectures did not generate the *Scholica*. Pré-

(47) See above, n. 17.

(48) *Le commentaire de Martin de Laon sur l'oeuvre de Martianus Capella*, in *Latomus*, XII (1953), pp. 437-59.

(49) *Martianus Capella and his Ninth Century Commentators*, p. 137.

aux's arguments, however, for attributing the Martianus Capella commentary to Martin are also suspect and thus the commentary cannot be used as additional evidence that Martin had nothing to do with the *Scholica*.

#### THE «DUNCAHT-MARTIN» COMMENTARY ON MARTIANUS CAPELLA

The Martianus Capella commentary formerly attributed to Duncaht of Reims and later attributed to Martin Hiberniensis reflects perfectly the christianization of the arts that took place during the Carolingian renaissance<sup>(50)</sup>. Influenced by the Neoplatonic theory of recollection, the commentator argued that the arts are innate in man and that, therefore, the process of education is a process of recollection. In a more profound sense, in recollecting the student not only acquired intellectual skills but he also progressed toward man's privileged status before the Fall, for the arts have not been invented by man but are a constituent part of his nature. The commentator implied that the cultivation of the arts is not merely a propaedeutic but rather a progress towards man's lost state of perfection<sup>(51)</sup>.

Who this commentator is I cannot say, but after first accepting the identification of Martin Hiberniensis as the author of the Duncaht commentary, I have reluctantly come to believe that the author of this commentary on the *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* has yet to be identified.

Martin certainly would seem to have some connection with the commentary. It is possible that he is its author. It is also equally possible that he knew and cited the work of someone else, or that both the author (hereafter, Anonymous) and Martin drew upon common sources.

In his article of 1953, Préaux first brought forth a series of logical and historical deductions which pointed to Martin as a likely candidate for the authorship of the commentary. These deductions, by Préaux's own admission, are extremely weak and

(50) See CORA E. LUTZ (ed.), *DUNCHAD, Glossae in Martianum* and PRÉAUX, *Le commentaire de Martin de Laon*.

(51) See the comment on IV, 347 of the *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (ed. A. DICK; rev. J. G. PRÉAUX, Stuttgart, 1969), p. 160, as reported in *DUNCHAD Glossae in Martianum*, ed. LUTZ, p. 22-23; and, Paris, B. N., lat. 8760, f. 38r.

I will not discuss them here<sup>(52)</sup>. Instead, I want to focus attention on a stronger argument for Martin's relationship with the Anonymous commentary – a comparison between certain notes in the Anonymous commentary and a note in Laon, Bibl. mun. 444, ff. 299r-v, Martin's Greek-Latin glossary and grammar. Arguments based on resemblances between the commentary and the *Scholica Graecarum glossarum*, obviously, cannot be used to strengthen Martin's candidacy for the commentary.

Martin's note in the Laon manuscript needs to be reproduced:<sup>(53)</sup>

#### VERSUS DE VIII MUSIS

Clio gesta canens transactis tempora reddit.	Clio historias, qui inter historias narrat de transactis rebus lo- quitur.
Dulciloquis calamos Euterpe 5 flatibus urguet	Euterpe tibias, id est, modulatio- nes.
Comica lascivo gaudet sermone Thalia.	Thalia comedias, id est rustica ioca
Melpomene tragico proclamat mesta boatu.	Melpomene tragoedias, id est quae- rimonias et dolores.
10 Therpsicore affectus cytharis movet, imperat, auget.	Therpsicore psalterium, id est com- punctiones modulationum.
Plectra gerens Erato saltat pede, carmine, vultu.	Erato geometrica, id est mensuram
Signat cuncta manu loquiturque 15 Polimnia gestu,	Polimnia rethoricam, id est elo- quen[tiam].
Uraniaque poli scrutatur undi- que musas.	Urania astrologiam, id est caeles- tia.
Carmina Caliope libris eroica mandat.	Caliope literam, id est gramma- ticam et metr[um].
20 Mentis Apollineae vis has movet undique Musas.	
In medio residens complectitur omnia Phoebus.	

Clio interpretatur bona fama, id est cogitatio quaerendae scientiae.

(52) See *Le commentaire de Martin de Laon*, pp. 441-43.

(53) Laon, Bibl. mun. 444, f. 299r-v. See also E. MILLER, *Glossaire grec-latin, de la Bibliothèque de Laon*, in *Notices et extraits*, XXIX, pt. 2 (1880), pp. 200-202.

25 Ergo propter bonam famam quaeritur scientia.

Euterpe interpretatur bene delectans. Prius enim est scientiam quaerere et postea delectari in ipsa.

Melpomene interpretatur meditationem faciens permanere. Primum est enim velle, secundum desiderare quod velis, tertium instare  
30 meditando ad id quod delectaris.

Thalia interpretatur capacitas et dicitur quasi Tithonlia, id est ponens germina. Ergo post meditandi instationem percipitur fructus, id est germen.

Polimnia dicitur quasi polimnenen, id est multam memoriam faciens  
35 quia post capacitatem est memoria necessaria.

Erato interpretatur inveniens similem quia post scientiam et memoriam iustum est ut aliquid simile et de suo inveniat.

Terpsicore interpretatur delectans instructionem. Ergo post inventionem oportet te iam discernere ac iudicare quod invenitur.

40 Urania interpretatur caelestis. Post enim diiudicationem eligis quid dicas, quid dispuas, eligere utile caducumque dispuere, caeleste ingenium est [f. 299v].

Caliope interpretatur sonorus vel bona vox, vel vox deae clamantis. Ergo post electionem dicendi, oportet ut bene et pulchre proferatur  
45 illud quod eligitur.

Est enim ordo: primum est velle doctrinam; secundum delectari quod velis; tertium instare ad id quod delectatus es; quartum **capere** ad quod instas; quintum memorari quod capis; sextum invenire de tuo simile ad quod memineris; septimum iudicare quod invenias; octavum  
50 est eligere de quo iudicas; nonum bene proferre quod elegeris.

Musa dicitur quasi moysa, id est aquatica. Nulla enim sonora vox potest esse sine aqua. A quo etiam nomine Moyses dicitur, id est aquaticus, eo quod in aqua sit inventus. Vel secundum ethimologiam grecam Musa dicta est APOTOYMOYCIN, id est a quaerendo, quia, ut antiqui  
55 voluerunt, vis carminum et modulatio vocum per eas inquirebatur. Nunc autem non solum dicitur illud instrumentum musa, sed omnis sonora vox musa dicitur. Martianus: Musae namque dictae sunt, ut ferunt, filiae Iunonis et Iovis, quia omnis vox ex aere et aethere efficitur et formatur secundum philosophicam rationem. Deus enim aetheris  
60 Iovis et dea aeris Iuno dicitur. Quorum nomina haec sunt: Urania quae interpretatur caelestis, ipsa est firmamentum; Polimnia multa memoria, id est Saturnus; Euterpe bene delectans, id est Iovis; Erato inveniens similem, id est Mars. Melpomene meditationem faciens permanere, id est Sol. Terpsicore delectans instructionem, id est Venus.  
65 Caliope sonorus, id est Mercurius; Clio interpretatur fama, id est Luna; Thalia interpretatur capacitas, ipsa est Terra.

•2 scilicet rebus *above* transactis; qui inter, *Miller ed.*, qui enim; 8 Melpomene *cod.*; 12 id est instrumentum citharae *above* Plectra; 20 id est virtutis *above* Mentis; 22 scilicet planetarum *above* In medio; 57 namque, *cod.*, nanque.

Before this note can be analyzed, it must be pointed out that Martin was responsible for copying it. Most of the material in the grammatical portion of the manuscript (ff. 276-319), in fact, was copied by his hand. Here, Martin gathered together a whole series of didactic texts which he carefully listed in the table of contents of his manuscript (f. 2v), e.g.: « Item greca Prisciani de octo partibus et constructione. Item greca de membris hominum. Item de inventione litterarum... Item greca diversa collecta. Item interpretationes novem musarum. Item alia greca. Item greca ad versus. Item greca de versibus Iohannis Scotti. Item versus grecisci. Item grecisca nomina. Item versus de viiii musis. Item declinationes grecorum. Item glossarium grecum. Item de nomine Ihesu ».

Martin, thus, certainly was acquainted with the note on the Muses. The important question, however, is whether he simply collected the glosses from other sources or whether the note derived from his own work. Many of the pieces in the grammatical portion of his manuscript were collected from other sources. In only one instance is any of this material credited directly to Martin<sup>(54)</sup>. All the rest, I would suggest, was collected from his reading.

As a teacher, Martin impresses me more as a compiler than as an original thinker. His introductory handbook to Latin literature, Laon, Bibl. mun. 468, amply proves this<sup>(55)</sup>. This manuscript introduced the student to the reading of Virgil and Sedulius. It is filled with lists and definitions designed to help the student in his reading. All this material can be traced back to Isidore of Seville and to Fulgentius who are cited verbatim. The note on the Muses reproduced above seems also to represent such a pastiche – a pastiche which included a fragment from a Martianus Capella commentary (ll. 57-66).

The note on the Muses can be divided into three parts. Part I consists of Ausonius's Idyll XX copied in the left column of folio 299r with Martin's parallel notes in the right column (ll. 1-23). Part II (ll. 24-50) presents another interpretation of the Muses in which they are arranged in a definite order symbolizing the

(54) At f. 296v, Martin noted that it was he who copied that section. A note at f. 297v attributes the verses on that leaf to Martin. See MGH, *P.L.*, III, pp. 696 (XII:ii), 697 (XII:v), 822-23 for these subscriptions.

(55) For this manuscript, see, in addition to my monograph noted in n. 1, my *A propos de quelques manuscrits de l'école de Laon au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle: Découvertes et problèmes*, in *Le Moyen Âge*, LXXXVIII (1972), pp. 14-28.

progress toward wisdom. Part III (ll. 51-66) completes the note with a series of explanations of the word *musa*.

Part I is influenced by Ausonius's poem. Part II derives almost directly from Fulgentius the Mythographer whom Martin cited earlier in Laon, Bibl. mun. 444 under the rubric, *Interpretationes VIII Musarum et quorundam grecorum nominum* (f. 293v)<sup>(56)</sup>. Many of the definitions in Part II, as Préaux discovered, are also found in the Anonymous Martianus Capella commentary<sup>(57)</sup>. The notes in both Laon, Bibl. mun. 444 and 468 prove that Martin knew his Fulgentius well, but he was certainly not the only ninth-century master to draw upon that author.

That the use of Fulgentius by Martin and Anonymous might only be coincidental is suggested by Anonymous's gloss on *Apol-line* (58). Here, Anonymous arranged the Muses in a progression that only superficially resembles Martin's arrangement in ll. 24-50 of his note. The only point of contact between Martin's arrangement and that of Anonymous consist in what both owe to Fulgentius. It is difficult to understand how the same master would arrive at two different schemes in the ascent to learning in which the positions assigned to the Muses are so different (59).

The strongest argument for Martin's knowledge of Anonymous's commentary occurs in Part III (ll. 51-66) of his note. Here he seems to cite Martianus Capella but in fact, as Préaux showed, the phrase «Musa namque... secundum philosophicam rationem» is almost exactly reproduced in the commentary of Anonymous (60). Is this congruence enough to identify Martin with Anonymous? I would hesitate to go that far. In the context of Part III, the definition of the Muses derived from Martianus is but one of three definitions offered in that part of the note. («Musa dicitur quasi...

(56) Compare, ll. 24-50 and FULGENTIUS, *Mitologiarum libri tres*, I, xv, ed. R. HELM Leipzig, 1898, p. 26, l. 2-27, l. 11). See also MILLER, *Glossaire grec-latin*, pp. 191-92.

(57) *Le commentaire de Martin de Laon*, pp. 452-53: «parallèle dans son esprit...».

(58) *Ibid.* This gloss does not appear in the edition of Lutz.

(59) Anonymous Martin, ll. 24-50

Iuxta vero leges allegoricae aptissimo Musarum usus est ordine: Urania igitur primo ponitur... Post hanc Pollimnia... Tertia hinc ponitur Euterpe... Inde Erato... Ideo subsequitur Melpomene, hinc Terpsicore... Callope... Inde Clio... sub qua Talia quasi in ultimo loco ponitur...	Clio... Euterpe... Melpomene... Thalia... Pollimnia... Erato... Terpsicore... Urania... Callope... Est enim ordo...
---	---

For the text in Anonymous, see *Ibid.*, pp. 452-53.

(60) *Ibid.*, pp. 447-48. It should be noted that the order of the names of the Muses in this section of Martin's note (ll. 60-66) follows the order of Anonymous.

Vel secundum ethimologiam... Martianus:...»). Martin patched together an explanation from three different sources, one of which was a Martianus Capella commentary. He may not even have thought that he was quoting a commentary since he seems to have ascribed Anonymous's comment to Martianus himself («Martianus:...»).

Two supplementary considerations should be noted. Not one of the manuscripts of the Anonymous commentary, as reported in Claudio Leonardi's census of *De nuptiis* manuscripts, has been traced either by origin or provenance to Laon (61). While this is an argument *ex silentio* against attributing a commentary to Martin, I think that it is worth remembering, especially in light of the fact that Laon's modest scriptorium specialized in didactic texts such as Laon, Bibl. mun. 444 and 468.

Secondly, we must admit that we do not know all the ninth-century masters who commented on the *De nuptiis*. John Scottus and Remigius of Auxerre certainly did. An additional commentary that Remigius drew upon survives as the Anonymous commentary. Remigius points to Heiric of Auxerre but Heiric, born in 840, may have been too young to have produced a commentary that Martin would have known before 875. Perhaps, however, Heiric taught from a commentary composed by Lupus of Ferrières, Haimo of Auxerre, or even Muridac whose career at Auxerre is just coming to light (62). A certain Winibertus, collaborator of John Scottus on the establishment of a faithful text of the *De nuptiis*, should also be remembered as should the author of a poem which shows a deep acquaintance with Martianus Capella (63). The candidacy of Duncaht of Reims also should not be ignored (64).

JOHN J. CONTRENI

(61) *I codici di Marziano Capella*, in *Aevum*, XXXIII (1959), pp. 443-89; XXXIV (1960), pp. 1-99, 411-524.

(62) BERNHARD BISCHOPP, *Muridac doctissimus plebis, ein irischer Grammatiker des IX. Jahrhunderts*, in *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 2, pp. 51-56; LOUIS HOLTZ, *Sur trois commentaires irlandais de l'Art Majeur de Donat au IXe siècle*, in *Revue d'histoire des textes*, II (1972), pp. 45-72.

(63) See CONTRENI, *A propos de quelques manuscrits*, pp. 9-14 (at p. 10, l. 7, *illud* should read *illum*); and CLAUDIO LEONARDI, *Nuove voci poetiche tra secolo IX e XI*, in *Studi medievali*, 3rd. ser., II (1961), p. 150.

(64) The sole mention of Duncaht credits him with commenting on the astrology of Martianus Capella (see London, British Library, Reg. 15 A XXXIII, f. 3r; and KENNEY, *Sources*, p. 573). While this note, by itself, is not enough evidence to attribute the Anonymous commentary to him, there is no reason to believe that he did not comment more extensively on the *De nuptiis*.